SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 06155 7956
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 06155 7873

5th
5/S

San Francisco Public Library

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
CIVIC CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102

REFERENCE BOOK

Not to be taken from the Library

JAN 2 2 2002

The available Agendas and Minutes of the Board of Examiners are included in this volume, but many are missing. The documents are for the years 1974-1980, with a few from 1987. During this period, the Board of Examiners served under the Department of Public Works.

Beginning in 1995, a Board of Examiners served under the Building Inspection Commission. Documents from that Board are not included here.

San Francisco Public Library
Government Information Center

3 1223 06155 7956

3 1223 06155 7873

1/30/74
SF
P85.35
#1

SF Dept. of Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

January 30, 1974

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of minutes of January 15, 1974.

NEW BUSINESS:

3. (74-4) Galewood Homes, Clarendon Way. Request for approval of Burnham/Holiday Boilers as heating service for a proposed hydronic heating system (Sec. 5125.E, San Francisco Building Code). Broadway Plumbing Company.

DOCUMENTS
JAN 28 1974
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

cc: City Librarian ✓

7 48550 SFPL: ECONO JRS
171 SFPL 12/20/02 75

SF Dept of Public Works
2/11/74
SF
P85.35
#1

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

March 11, 1974

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of Special Meeting-January 30, 1974.

NEW BUSINESS:

3. (74-5) 170 Otis Street, Administration Building, Department of Social Services. Request for variance to permit wood forms to remain in place between abutting buildings, impeding seismic drift (Sec. 2314.F, San Francisco Building Code). Garo Dorian, AIA.

4. (74-6) 170 Otis Street, Administration Building, Department of Social Services. Request for variance re: discharging of two sinks by other than gravity drainage (Sec. 408, San Francisco Plumbing Code). Garo Dorian, AIA.

5. (74-7) 50 California Street. Request for variance re: Western Union tie-in to emergency generator system (Sec. 700.13, San Francisco Electrical Code). 50 California Building Corp.

6. (74-8) Levi Strauss Building, Embarcadero Center. Request for variance re: plastic entrance canopies (Secs. 1710, 5210; San Francisco Building Code). John Portman and Associates.

7. (74-9) Request for approval of Group 2 or better, Douglas fir plywood, of C-C Exterior Grade, of 1/2 inch minimum thickness for use as blindwall weatherboarding (Sec. 2517.G.2, San Francisco Building Code). Western Wood Preservers Institute.

cc: City Librarian

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/minutes1974sanf_0

3-18-74

SF Dept of Public Works

SF
P85.35
#2

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

March 18, 1974

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Oliphant, Degenkolb, Hatch, Gendler. Stoeckle, Lera (for Item No. 5 only).

Secretary: A. Goldberg
Fire Dept. Representatives: Lt. Engler
Chief Plumbing Inspector, K. Lewis
Chief Electrical Inspector, W. Maitland

MEMBERS ABSENT: Messrs. Raffin, Balling

DOCUMENTS

APR 17 1974

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

Tape 92
Side A

460 Meeting called to order by Mr. Oliphant at 7:10 PM

Agenda adopted as written, redated March 18, 1974, except Item No. 4 to follow Item No. 5. Election of Officers added as Item No. 2a.

Minutes of January 30, 1974, Special Meeting adopted as prepared, by unanimous vote.

ITEM 2a. ELECTION OF OFFICERS: CHAIRMAN OLIPHANT, VICE-CHAIRMAN RAFFIN - Mr. Degenkolb moved to continue same officers: Mr. Oliphant, Chairman; Mr. Raffin, Vice-Chairman.

Adopted unanimously.

488 ITEM 3 (74-5). 170 OTIS STREET, ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE TO PERMIT WOOD FORMS TO REMAIN IN PLACE BETWEEN ABUTTING BUILDINGS, IMPEDING SEISMIC DRIFT (SEC. 2314.F, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). GARO DORIAN, AIA.

Mr. Goldberg described request.

Lt. Engler inquired regarding width of space which will contain combustibles.

500 Mr. Garo Dorian, Architect, described request.

Mr. V. DeNevers, SE, read his letter of January 10, 1974, into the record.

522 Mr. Goldberg inquired regarding width of space.

Mr. DeNevers stated that it would be one inch at bottom to three inches at top.

560 Mr. Dorian summed up his request.

Mr. Oliphant closed floor discussion.

Board discussion.

Mr. Degenkolb moved granting of variance.

575 Adopted unanimously.

Mr. Oliphant rescheduled Item 4 to follow forthwith.

ITEM 4 (74-6) 170 OTIS STREET. ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE REGARDING DISCHARGING OF TWO SINKS BY OTHER THAN GRAVITY DRAINAGE (SEC. 408, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE). GARO DORIAN, AIA.

Mr. Goldberg described request.

594 Mr. K. Lewis, Chief Plumbing Inspector, requested additional information.

600 Mr. Leonard Lewis presented additional plan sheet of basement. He described location of sinks on first floor and alternate solutions to the problem.

710 Mr. K. Lewis noted lack of vents for basement drains, as well as other incompleteness of information.

725 Mr. Oliphant suggested that all options had not been sufficiently explored to provide basis for a variance.

740 Messrs. Leonard Lewis and Garo Dorian accepted suggested approach.

Mr. Oliphant deferred further consideration to a subsequent meeting if necessary.

755 ITEM 5 (74-7) 50 CALIFORNIA STREET. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE REGARDING WESTERN UION TIE-IN TO EMERGENCY GENERATOR SYSTEM (SEC. 700.13, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE). 50 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CORPORATION.

Mr. Lera was seated.

Mr. Goldberg described request and the background reasons for maintaining maximum capacity of emergency power system. Additionally, he requested general guidance from Board in regard to permissible connected loads added to emergency power systems.

Mr. Maitland reiterated Mr. Goldberg's description.

780 Messrs. Encinger and Liloia formulated the general request.

798 Mr. Webster of Glumac pointed to his request as submitted by letter and discussed details as requested by Board members.

880 Mr. Liloia stated that WU system would carry certain essential communications in event of a major disaster such as earthquake.

925 Mr. Oliphant deferred further consideration to a later time in the meeting, due to uncertainty as to total power demands.

930 ITEM 6 (74-8) LEVI STRAUSS BUILDING, EMBARCADERO CENTER. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE REGARDING PLASTIC ENTRANCE CANOPIES (SECS. 1710, 5210; SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). JOHN PORTMAN AND ASSOCIATES.

Mr. Oliphant queried Board members about possible conflicts of interest. It was established that, on the face of it, no apparent conflicts of interest existed in case of Mr. Hatch and Mr. Oliphant. There was no objection to this ruling by the proponent.

Mr. Goldberg described request as similar to a previous variance granted in 1969, namely to install plastic canopies at certain entrances to building.

960 Lt. Engler called attention to the current questioning of appropriateness of the ASTM E84 test to justify use of plastics.

Mr. Goldberg described current issue of FTC actions in regard to plastics as primarily related to foamed plastics and thus not relevant to acrylics of this request.

883 Mr. Hornyak described request as same as 1969 variance.

994 Mr. Degenkolb moved granting of variance with same stipulations as 1969 variance, File 69-11.

Board adopted unanimously.

1000 ITEM 5 (74-7) - CONTINUED.

Board discussion of possible approaches to requests for tie-ins to emergency power systems, with the general conclusion that consideration can be given at this time only to a specific single-job variance request rather than to a general interpretation.

1115 Mr. Oliphant stated that further information is required in any case about the elevator motor nameplate.

Mr. Liloia stated that WU should be considered as a public utility.

1140 Mr. Lera moved for continuance to a subsequent meeting.

Board adopted unanimously.

Mr. Lera vacated seat at conclusion of this item.

1145 ITEM 7 (74-9) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF GROUP 2 OR BETTER, DOUGLAS FIR PLYWOOD, OF C-C EXTERIOR GRADE, OF 1/2 INCH MINIMUM THICKNESS FOR USE AS BLINDWALL WEATHERBOARDING (SEC. 2517.G.2, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). WESTERN WOOD PRESERVERS INSTITUTE.

Mr. Goldberg described request and previous history as well as uniqueness of blindwalls to San Francisco and a few other jurisdictions.

1160 Lt. Engler stated that Fire Department had no position on this item.

1165 Mr. John Fies, consultant to appellant, stated that protection of one owner from adjoining owner in regard to fire depends on the interior finish of the blindwall assemblies rather than on the sheathing.

1190 Mr. Jurgens, of Western Wood Preservers Institute, stated that the treatment is permanent and will not leach, and is all waterborne, with exterior glue.

1265 Mr. Degenkolb moved approval of Group 2 or better Douglas Fir Plywood provided face and back are C-C Exterior, glue is exterior, thickness is one-half inch minimum, and only waterborne preservatives are used per AWPA Standards C1 and C9 and AWPB LP-2.

1270 Board adopted unanimously.

Next meeting set for April 30, 1974.

1285 Mr. Oliphant adjourned meeting at 9:00 PM.

Alfred O'Malley

SF Dept. of Public Works

4/30/74
SF
P85.35
#1

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

April 30, 1974

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of minutes of March 18, 1974.

NEW BUSINESS

3. (74-10) Request for approval of Flexmaster Triple Lock Flexible Aluminum Duct (Sec. 5131.A; Table No. 51-E; San Francisco Building Code). Flexmaster Company Limited.

DOCUMENTS
APR 23 1974
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

cc: City Librarian

SF Dept of Public Works

REVISED 4/22/74

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

April 30, 1974

4/30/74
Rev.
SF
P85.35
#1

DOCUMENTS
APR 24 1974
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of minutes of March 18, 1974.

NEW BUSINESS

3. (74-10) Request for approval of Flexmaster Triple Lock Flexible Aluminum Duct (Sec. 5131.A; Table No. 51-E; San Francisco Building Code). Flexmaster Company Limited.

4. (74-11) 425 Market Street, Metropolitan Life Building. Request for variance in regard to discharge of cooling water (Sections 601 and 609, San Francisco Plumbing Code). Anderson, Rowe & Buckley, Mechanical Contractors.

cc: City Librarian

S.F. Dept. of Public Works
DOCUMENTS
MAY 6 1974
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
1974
SF
85.35
#2

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

April 30, 1974

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Degenkolb, Gendler, Stoeckle, Balling
Secretary: Mr. Goldberg
Fire Dept.Representative: Lt.Engler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Messrs. Raffin, Oliphant, Hatch

Tape 1290 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 7:10PM Agenda adopted unanimously after information by Mr. Goldberg that applicant for Item 3 (74-10) would not appear due to non-delivery of our mailed notice, caused by Canadian Postal Service strike.

Minutes of March 18, 1974, meeting adopted as prepared, by unanimous vote.

1310 ITEM 4 (74-11) 425 MARKET STREET, METROPOLITAN LIFE BUILDING. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE IN REGARD TO DISCHARGE OF COOLING WATER (SECTIONS 601 and 609, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE). ANDERSON, ROWE & BUCKLEY, MECHANICAL CONTRACTORS.

Mr. Goldberg described the request for variance and read relevant requirements of Sections 609 and D5.4 of the San Francisco Plumbing Code.

Mr. Michael Aden, of Anderson, Rowe & Buckley, introduced Mr. Carrodus of Bechtel Inc.

1330 Mr. Carrodus described source of problem as due to tenant modifications after completion of building, specifically by addition of cooling units resulting in a small amount of condensate drainage on six floors (and possibly a seventh). He requested acceptance of a high-dome overflow strainer in lieu of the code-required overflow drain.

1380 Mr. Goldberg requested information about the maximum quantity of drainage expected.

Mr. Carrodus stated 1½ gallons per hour for 2 to 3 hours at most.

1440 Mr. Gendler requested information as to how the chill water and power lines were installed after completion of finish, and yet overflow drains could not be provided.

1460 Messrs. Aden and Carrodus stated that construction of finish was proceeding during installation of the units, and available shaft for new drain is too small for access.

1520 Mr. Carrodus stated that it would be a hardship to break overflows into the installed sinks.

1560 Mr. Degenkolb moved granting of variance as requested in recognition of the minor quantity of flow involved; for subject building only. Mr. Balling seconded the motion.

Board adopted unanimously.

Next meeting set for June 4, 1974.

1600 Meeting adjourned at 7:45 PM.

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:kz

SF Dept of Public Works
6/11/74
SF
P85.35
#1

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

June 11, 1974

DOCUMENTS
JUN 6
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of minutes of April 30, 1974.

NEW BUSINESS

3. (74-10) Request for approval of Flexmaster Triple Lock Flexible Aluminum Duct (Sec. 5131.A; Table No. 51-E; San Francisco Building Code). Flexmaster Company Limited.

cc: City Librarian

SF Dept of Planning Info Ctr
6/18/74
SF
P85.35
#1

June 11 meeting postponed to June 18, 1974

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

June 18, 1974

DOCUMENTS
JUN 14 1974
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of minutes of April 30, 1974.

NEW BUSINESS

3. (74-10) Request for approval of Flexmaster Triple Lock Flexible Aluminum Duct (Sec. 5131.A; Table No. 51-E; San Francisco Building Code). Flexmaster Company Limited.

4. (74-12) Liberty House, Stockton and O'Farrell Streets. Request for variance to install awnings in excess of 50% of building frontages (Sec. 4506.A, San Francisco Building Code). Hadley Properties, Inc.

cc: City Librarian

SF 6/18/74
385.35
#2

SF Dept of Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

June 18, 1974

DOCUMENTS
JUN 2 1 1974
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Oliphant, Gendler, Hatch, Raffin, Stoeckle.
Secretary: Mr. Goldberg.
Fire Dept. Representative: Lt. Engler.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Degenkolb.

TAPE 92, SIDE 1

1600 Meeting called to order by Mr. Oliphant at 7:10 p. m.

Agenda adopted unanimously.

Minutes of meeting of April 30, 1974.

ITEM 3. (74-10) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF FLEXMASTER TRIPLE LOCK FLEXIBLE ALUMINUM DUCT (SEC. 5131.A; TABLE NO. 51-E; SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). FLEXMASTER COMPANY LIMITED.

1615 Mr. Goldberg described request, citing requirements of Sec. 5131.A and Table No. 51-E, which define minimum wall thicknesses for aluminum ducts. He stated that no data had been presented to demonstrate equivalent strength of the corrugated duct as comparable to a code-complying duct.

1670 Lt. Engler, SFFD, concurred with the Superintendent.

1675 Mr. Wood, of Flexmaster Co., stated that he sought approval for use wherever non-metallic duct is permitted; submitted duct is definitely superior, passed tests per UL Standard No. 181 and ASTM E-84 (zero flame spread, fuel contributed and smoke density.).

1710 Mr. Goldberg re-iterated code requirement; UL No. 181 is a basic requirement, not an extra.

1740 Mr. Canipe, of Air Conditioning Co., Inc., described the operating parameters of subject duct as appreciably higher than would be required for low pressure use.

1790 Mr. Canipe limited his request for low pressure use.

1840 Mr. Wood stated limits of request as being for low pressure side and connector use.

1850 Board discussion as to extent of request.

1880 Mr. Wood revised request for use as connector but with length permitted to be 16 feet.

TAPE 92, SIDE 2

000 Mr. Goldberg read Sec. 5131.B in regard to non-metallic ducts.

005 Mr. Wood restated request as for use of Flexmaster Duct, all diameters, uninsulated only, for use as connectors only, but with a permitted maximum length of each duct to be 16 feet.

015 Board discussion.

060 Mr. Wood amended request to limit length as connector to 10 feet.

065 Mr. Oliphant noted that, in view of the amended request, no Board action was required since Bureau would grant approval as a connector; however, applicant may seek further consideration at a future time, without prejudice, by presenting an amended request substantiated by additional data.

ITEM 4. (74-12) LIBERTY HOUSE, STOCKTON AND O'FARRELL STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE TO INSTALL AWNINGS IN EXCESS OF 50% OF BUILDING FRONTAGES (SEC. 4506.A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). HADLEY PROPERTIES, INC.

075 Mr. Goldberg described request, noting that the supervised sprinkler system in subject building was already required for other purposes.

085 Lt. Engler read letter from Chief Condon dated June 13, 1974.

090 Mr. Whalen showed rendering of building and described general concept of the design. Sprinklers are also provided at soffits of openings.

Board discussion.

135 Mr. Hatch moved granting of variance.

Board adopted unanimously.

Next meeting set for August 5, 1974, with possible alternative being July 29th.

160 Mr. Raffin requested replacement as vice-chairman for personal reasons. This matter will be placed on agenda of subsequent meeting.

180 Mr. Oliphant adjourned meeting at 8:15 p. m.

William A Kastins
for Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:cc
cc: City Librarian

SF Dept. of Public Works
8/5/74
SF
P85:35
#1

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

August 5, 1974

DOCUMENTS
JUL 31 1974
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of June 18, 19 4 meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

3. (73-13) 2183-85 Union Street, 2962-64 Fillmore Street. Request for Variance re: number of stories in Type 5 building (Sec. 507, San Francisco Building Code). Rene Louis Cardinaux, Architect AIA - Rehearing request in regard to winder stairs and exit separation.

4. (73-20) Existing family housing projects, various locations Request for Variance re: connection to existing kitchen waste line for clothes washers. (Sec. 701.C.1, San Francisco Plumbing Code) San Francisco Housing Authority, Walter L. Scott, II, Acting Executive Director - Rehearing request in regard to shut-off valves.

5. (72-21) Yerba Buena Center Exhibit Hall. Request for Variance, Occupant Load, Assembly Area. (Sec. 3301.D, San Francisco Building Code) McCue Boone Tomsick.

6. (73-4) Yerba Buena Center Exhibit Hall. Request for Variance in method of computing travel distance to a smoke and heat barrier (Sec. 3301.C.20, San Francisco Building Code). McCue Boone Tomsick.

NEW BUSINESS

7. (74-13) Request for Approval of Michel & Pfeffer Steel Reinforced P.V.C. Windows for use in Type I buildings over 75 feet high. (Sec. 1705.B, Article 52; San Francisco Building Code) Michel & Pfeffer, Architectural Windows and Door Systems.

8. (74-14) 530 Bush Street. Request for Variance re: exposed structural steel protected by fire sprinklers (Sec. 508, San Francisco Building Code). Storek & Storek, Architecture.

9. (74-15) 530 Bush Street. Request for Variance re: unprotected Robertson QL-99 deck span of 15'-6" for one-hour fire rating (General Approval 126R4.9 and 126R4.13). Storek & Storek, Architecture.

cc: City Librarian

8/5/74
SF
P85.35
#1

SF Public Library

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

August 5, 1974

DOCUMENTS
AUG 5 1974
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of June 18, 1974 meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

3. (73-13) 2183-85 Union Street, 2962-64 Fillmore Street. Request for Variance re: number of stories in Type 5 building (Sec. 507, San Francisco Building Code). Rene Louis Cardinaux, Architect AIA - Rehearing request in regard to winder stairs and exit separation.

4. (73-20) Existing family housing projects, various locations Request for Variance re: connection to existing kitchen waste line for clothes washers. (Sec. 701.C.1, San Francisco Plumbing Code) San Francisco Housing Authority, Walter L. Scott, II, Acting Executive Director - Rehearing request in regard to shut-off valves.

NEW BUSINESS

5. (74-13) Request for Approval of Michel & Pfeffer Steel Reinforced P.V.C. Windows for use in Type I buildings over 75 feet high. (Sec. 1705.B, Article 52; San Francisco Building Code) Michel & Pfeffer, Architectural Windows and Door Systems.

6. (74-14) 530 Bush Street. Request for Variance re: exposed structural steel protected by fire sprinklers (Sec. 508, San Francisco Building Code). Storek & Storek, Architecture.

7. (74-15) 530 Bush Street. Request for Variance re: unprotected Robertson QL-99 deck span of 15'-6" for one-hour fire rating (General Approval 126R4.9 and 126R4.13). Storek & Storek, Architecture.

cc: City Librarian

8/12/74
Special
SF
P85.35
#1

SF - Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

DOCUMENTS
AUG 5
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

SPECIAL MEETING - August 12, 1974

1. Adoption of Agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

2. (72-21) Yerba Buena Center Exhibit Hall. Request for Variance, Occupant Load, Assembly Area. (Sec. 3301.D, San Francisco Building Code) McCue Boone Tomsick.

3. (73-4) Yerba Buena Center Exhibit Hall. Request for Variance in method of computing travel distance to a smoke and heat barrier (Sec. 3301.C.20, San Francisco Building Code). McCue Boone Tomsick.

cc: City Librarian

9/10/74
SF
P85.35
#1
c.2

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

BUREAU
OF
BUILDING INSPECTION

RM. 202, 450 McALLISTER
SAN FRANCISCO
CALIFORNIA 94102

DOCUMENTS
AUG 16 1974
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

August 12, 1974

Board of Examiners
File No. 72-21
File No. 73-4
Yerba Buena Center
Exhibit Hall
Secs. 3301.D, 3301.C.20
San Francisco Building Code

TO: BOARD OF EXAMINERS

The Special Meeting scheduled for August 12, 1974 relative to the above subject has been rescheduled to September 10, 1974, commencing at 7:00 p. m. in Room 282 of City Hall. Please notify my office if you will not be able to attend this meeting.

Very truly yours,

Alfred Goldberg

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

9-10-74
SF Public Works
SF
P85.25
#2
DOCUMENTS
OCT 2 1974
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

September 10, 1974

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Degenkolb, Gendler, Hatch, Stoeckle.
Secretary: Mr. Goldberg.
Fire Dept. Representatives: Chief Condon, Lt. Engler.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Messrs. Oliphant, Raffin.

TAPE 93
SIDE 1

000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Degenkolb at 7:09 p. m.

Delayed starting discussion of items pending arrival of Chief Condon.

Mr. Goldberg discussed subject of Board decisions and possible conflict of interest. He stated advice he had gotten from City Attorney that no problems existed for items on tonight's agenda because there are no decisions the Board must make in which a member had a direct financial interest.

035 Agenda adopted.

Mr. Goldberg noted that Items 4 and 5 were previously approved, contingent upon implementation of a satisfactory Management Control Program. During discussion of Item 5, it became evident that a third variance was required and this is Item 2 (73-4).

040 ITEM 2 (73-4). YERBA BUENA CENTER. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE TO UTILIZE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN ENTRANCE LOBBIES AND STAIRS AS PART OF EXITING SYSTEM.

Mr. Goldberg reviewed previous variances conditionally granted by the Board (Items 4 and 5).

070 Mr. Hatch recounted that in approving Items 4 and 5 previously the Board assumed that all exits were to conform to Code. It was discovered that the monumental stairs in the lobbies do not conform.

080 Mr. Hayes reviewed background and current design provisions for project. Mr. Goldberg voiced surprise at elimination of TV surveillance of exhibit hall and other areas.

120 Mr. Hayes reviewed Life Safety System items.

135 Mr. Hayes stated his belief that in an emergency people will try to depart the way they came, i. e. the monumental stairs; and, therefore, these stairs should be considered as part of the emergency exit system.

150 Mr. Degenkolb requested Mr. Hayes to review how all exits get to the street.

Discussion between Messrs. Hayes, Tomsick and Board on exit patterns.

215 Mr. Hatch noted that these stairs also serve the meeting rooms, which have an occupancy load of over 4000 persons.

250 Mr. Hayes said there are sufficient code required exit ways and widths from all of the meeting and exhibit rooms providing some credit is given to the monumental stairs.

260 Mr. Hayes noted that Arena exits to Third, Howard and Folsom--no required exit through South concourse entry.

280 Mr. Hatch objected to calling the two lobby areas "Areas of Refuge." Too many rooms emptying into them. These areas do not have same fire resistance construction as required for stairways.

300 Mr. Tomsick said it is not possible to design a building for this site that could meet Code. The Code was not written to cover a building this size.

305 Mr. Hayes describes surface finishes in project. Mostly concrete, porcelain enamel panels, paint over gyp board. No plastic or foam.

350 Mr. Hatch voiced concern over fuel content of furniture, drapes, etc.

395 Mr. Degenkolb expressed inclination to view the lobbies as part of exit ways, but shared Mr. Hatch's concern over fuel contribution of contents in lobbies.

Discussion of smoke control.

465 Mr. Degenkolb asks for comments from Messrs. Condon, Engler, Goldberg.

480 Mr. Goldberg said overall package is reasonable. Believed meeting room complexes should have smoke control provided.

485 Mr. Condon wants TV surveillance, more for crowd control than smoke detection.

520 Discussion of flame spread, fuel contribution of furnishings, rugs, etc.

545 Mr. Goldberg suggested that all materials in furnishings shall meet same requirements as for building. Make this a guideline to management and the MCP.

560 Chief Condon said low fire load furnishings are available and his Bureau is in the process of proposing regulations for furnishings, rugs, etc., used in areas of public assembly.

590 Mr. Engler recounted criteria he used in plan checking this project on piecemeal basis when assigned to BBI. Project considered as two-story building.

Mr. Engler noted there are 100 - 5' wide exits that go directly to the outside, not counting those that go via the monumental stairs. This is sufficient to evacuate 25,000 persons.

Mr. Engler discussed question of how fast a large building should be evacuated. He noted the lack of accepted, or advocated, criteria.

630 Mr. Condon feels there is not a fire problem. FP controls closely what goes in exhibit halls. Smoke generation may be a problem but should not affect exiting from exhibit halls. Possible problem area is exiting from meeting rooms into concourse entry. This can be minimized by limiting fuel loading in concourse areas.

650 Mr. Condon feels main problem is crowd and panic control.

660 Chief Condon wants testing of completed Life Safety System, not just component parts. Concerned because a mechanical system is being substituted for 2-hour exitways in concourse areas.

670 Chief Condon sees no problem with exhibit hall. He believes that, theoretically, the smoke control and furnishings control in the concourse areas will prevent problems of exiting from meeting rooms.

680 Chief Condon restated his belief of need for TV surveillance for crowd control.

690 Discussion of location of smoke detectors.

720 Chief Condon believed smoke generation in meeting rooms can cause problems in concourse area; stressed need for control of materials of construction in meeting rooms.

740 Discussion of roll-down shutters, resulting exit pattersn when they are deployed.

750 Chief Condon felt doors from meeting rooms into concourse should be rated doors with hold-open devices.

Discussion of exit patterns and exitway construction.

810 Mr. Degenkolb asks for motion.

820 Mr. Gendler asks question of seismic design for Life Safety System. Mr. Goldberg answers that Code requires System to be operable after .5g shock.

845 Mr. Tomsick stated that mechanical engineer must design for the maximum creditable earthquake used by Blume's office.

855 Mr. Degenkolb repeats request for motion on Item 2.

860 Mr. Gendler moved that variance be granted to utilize the Northern and Southern entrance lobbies and stairs as part of the exiting system.

QUALIFICATIONS:

1. Smoke removal from meeting rooms.
2. Control over furniture and materials and finishes.

870 Mr. Degenkolb listed qualifications.

1. Smoke removal system from No. 2 level meeting rooms.
2. Reaffirm stand on need for TV surveillance.
3. Demonstrate the system will work in a physical test.
4. Adequate exits in the folding walls.
5. Kitchen hoods will have fire protection systems.
6. Sprinklers throughout.
7. Previous Life Safety items.
8. Seismic considerations (for the maximum creditable earthquake).
9. Management Control Program when acceptable.

Mr. Degenkolb clarified qualification No. 3. Testing by a qualified independent testing agency. Results satisfactory to BBI and FP.

Mr. Stoeckle seconds motion.

Mr. Hatch wanted the motion to be clarified by changing "...and stairs..." to "...and monumental stairs..."

Vote: Ayes - 3, Nos - 1

ITEM 3. YERBA BUENA CENTER. ACCEPTANCE OF MANAGEMENT CONTROL PROGRAM.

Mr. Goldberg discussed procedure for implementation. If this Board agrees to the proposed MCP, then it will be submitted as a resolution to Board of Supervisors recommending Board of Supervisors enact MCP as City policy and MCP to become a part of all documents pertaining to leases and operations, etc.

Discusion of Management Control Program.

Mr. Burris stated MCP draft in the Board members' possession has been changed in one area. On page 2, the phrase, "by a physical test" has been inserted after "...to be demonstrated."

Mr. Burris stated that personnel to run the MCP must be satisfactory to BBI and FP. He said a non-profit organization is proposed to run the MCP, to be composed of all consultants who worked on project.

Mr. Degenkolb stated tonight's documents and actions should be included in proposed program document.

Mr. Hatch moved for acceptance of MCP proposal subject to inclusion of items discussed this evening, including paragraph on limitation of nature of furnishings. Board reaffirmed Items 4 and 5 which were previously approved by the Board subject to MCP.

Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 4 (72-21) AND ITEM 5 (73-4). YERBA BUENA CENTER.

Mr. Hatch moved that once the Board of Supervisors adopts this MCP just approved by this Board, it validates this Board's variances of Items 2, 4 and 5.

1055 Board adopted unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 p. m.

No date set for next meeting due to vacation conflicts.

Alfred Goldberg

FL:cc
cc: City Librarian

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

9/10/74
SF
P&S.35
#1

SF = Public Library

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

December 16, 1974

DOCUMENTS
DEC 13 1974
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of September 10, 1974.

OLD BUSINESS

3. (73-4) Yerba Buena Center, Exhibit Hall. Letter from Gayner Engineers re: Meeting of November 18, 1974 re: smoke removal system in north and south galleries.

4. (72-17) Provisional Approval No. 900A40.1, Audio-Fire Alert. Request for extension of approval. Harry Goodwater, Audio-Alert.

NEW BUSINESS

5. (74-16) 1301 Stockton Street. Request for variance re: Change of Occupancy from F2 to B3 relating to height of building (Sec. 507, San Francisco Building Code.). William M. Abend, AIA, Architect.

6. (74-17) 1530 Leavenworth Street. Request for variance re: Sizing of water piping (Sec. 1009.E, San Francisco Plumbing Code.). D. I. Chadbourne, Inc.

7. (74-18) 174 Graystone Terrace. Request for variance re: Plastic vent pipe (Art. 2, San Francisco Plumbing Code.). Paul Walti, 174 Graystone Terrace.

8. (74-19) Embarcadero Center, 350 Sacramento Street. Request for variance re: Location of sprinkler heads in relation to obstructions (Sec. 3802.B.1, San Francisco Building Code and NFPA Pamphlet No. 13). Embarcadero Center Block 230 Associates, Glumac and Webster Consulting Engineers.

9. (74-20) Bank of Tokyo, Crnr. California and Sansome Streets. Request for variance re: Sloping of service ramp (Sec. 1109.G.5, San Francisco Building Code). Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, Architects-Engineers.

cc: City Librarian ✓

SF Public Works
BOARD OF EXAMINERS
DOCUMENTS
DEC 30 1974
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
12/16/74
SF
P85.35
#2

MINUTES OF MEETING

December 16, 1974

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Oliphant, Degenkolb, Gendler, Hatch, Stoeckle, Salling (For Items 6 and 7).

Secretary: A. Goldberg
Fire Dept. Repr.: Insp. J. Gustafson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Raffin

TAPE 93
SIDE 2

000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Oliphant at 7:05 p. m.
Agenda adopted unanimously.
Minutes of meetings of August 5 and September 10, 1974 adopted unanimously as written.

ITEM 3. (73-4) YERBA BUENA CENTER, EXHIBIT HALL. LETTER FROM GAYNER ENGINEERS RE: MEETING OF NOVEMBER 18, 1974 RE: SMOKE REMOVAL SYSTEM IN NORTH AND SOUTH GALLERIES.

025 Discussion in regard to manual or automatic resetting of smoke control dampers, in reference to letter dated November 20, 1974 by Gayner Engineers.

Mr. Goldberg suggested deletion of last sentence in third paragraph of letter.

Mr. Gustafson, of S. F. Fire Dept., concurred.

050 Mr. Gendler moved acceptance of letter of November 20, 1974, as modified.

Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 4. (72-17) PROVISIONAL APPROVAL NO. 900A40.1, AUDIO-FIRE ALERT. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF APPROVAL. HARRY GOODWATER, AUDIO-ALERT.

057 Mr. Goldberg stated that the interim approval for this system was expiring.

Mr. Gustafson of SFFD recommended approval of extension.

Mr. Goodwater, of Audio-Alert, described problems of delays in processing of NFPA standards which will be the criteria when adopted.

075 Mr. Degenkolb moved extension for one year.

Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 5. (74-16) 1301 STOCKTON STREET. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY FROM F2 TO B3 RELATING TO HEIGHT OF BUILDING (SEC. 507, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). WILLIAM M. ABEND, AIA, ARCHITECT.

077 Mr. Goldberg described the request.

Mr. Gustafson of SFFD stated that the variance was acceptable provided that:

1. Two-hour separation for B3 occupancy.
2. Sprinkler system including supervision.
3. Cooking hood and grease duct system protection.

090 Mr. Abend noted that corner location of building provided very good access for Fire Dept., and there would be two means of egress from the B3 as well as from the basement.

120 Mr. Goldberg recommended that Board note that basement should not be used for cooking nor public assembly and this should be stipulated.

130 Mr. Degenkolb moved granting of variance, with conditions discussed.

Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 6. (74-17) 1530 LEAVENWORTH STREET. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: SIZING OF WATER PIPING (SEC. 1009.E, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE). D. T. CHADBOURNE, INC.

139 Mr. Goldberg described request, noting that Bureau does not have staff to provide detailed checking of mechanical calculations.

Mr. Lewis, Chief Plumbing Inspector, stated that inspected work was undersized per Code tables; and tha the submitted calculations failed to take into account all relevant factors.

Mr. Goldberg stated that due to lack of engineering staff, calculations could only be accepted if submitted by registered Mechanical Engineer.

Mr. Gustafson stated no comment by SFFD.

165 Mr. Chadbourne stated that there was no intention to construct to standards less than Code.

Mr. Chadbourne, Jr., described the calculations which he submitted.

220 Mr. Goldberg rephrased request to be whether Sec. 1009.E could be applied by a non-professional.

Mr. Oliphant noted that apparently this was a case where a contractor designed and installed a system for an owner; and this is acceptable under Contractor's License Law.

230 Discussion of calculation details.

290 Mr. Goldberg asked Board whether application of BMS 66 requires professional judgment or whether that standard can be applied by anyone.

330 Board discussion.

390 Mr. Degenkolb moved:

1. That use of BMS 66 be permitted under San Francisco Plumbing Code.

2. In absence of qualified engineering staff in the Bureau of Building Inspection, it is the responsibility of the applicant to provide conclusive proof, by professional review and report that submitted calculations do comply with BMS 66.

Board adopted: 4 Ayes, 1 No, 1 Abstention.

ITEM 7 (74-18) 174 GRAYSTONE TERRACE. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: PLASTIC VENT PIPE (ART. 2, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE). PAUL WALTI, 174 GRAYSTONE TERRACE.

450 Mr. Goldberg described request.

Mr. Lewis stated that work was done without permit and details thereof did not comply with San Francisco Plumbing Code.

475 Mr. Paul Walti stated that the plastic pipe portion was done without permit, but the copper piping was pre-existing and had been done by a Contractor under permit.

505 Mr. Goldberg noted that this was in a three-story building as defined by Code.

540 Mr. Stoeckle moved granting of variance, as a one time variance, provided the installation of the plastic pipe is verified to have been done in a legal manner.

Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 8. (74-19) EMBARCADERO CENTER, 350 SACRAMENTO STREET. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: LOCATION OF SPRINKLER HEADS IN RELATION TO OBSTRUCTIONS (SEC. 3802.B.1, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING AND NFPA PAMPHLET NO. 13). EMBARCADERO CENTER BLOCK 230 ASSOCIATES, GLUMAC AND WEBSTER CONSULTING ENGINEERS.

545 Mr. Goldberg described request.

555 Mr. Gustafson of SFFD cited Inspector Scott as having originally determined that the sprinklers were obstructed by the banners.

560 Mr. Hornyak described history of project. He stated that extension of sprinkler piping would create a hazard to pedestrians due to insufficient headroom.

Film demonstration by Mr. Glumac.

650 Board discussion.

665 Mr. Gendler moved granting of variance for the installations at Embarcadero No. 1 and No. 2.

Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 9. (74-20) BANK OF TOKYO, CRNR. CALIFORNIA AND SANSOME STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: SLOPING OF SERVICE RAMP (SEC. 1109.G.5, 1004.1, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). SKIDMORE, OWINGS AND MERRILL, ARCHITECTS -ENGINEERS.

690 Mr. Goldberg described request.

Mr. Hilborn of SOM described the design as having attempted to get ramp slope as close to 15 percent as possible.

750 Board discussion.

770 Mr. Degenkolb moved granting of one-time variance, with all indicated safety measures including audio and visual automatic warnings.

775 Board adopted unanimously.

780 Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p. m.

Next meeting tentatively set for January 20, 1975.

WK:cc
cc: City Librarian

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

SF Dept of Public Works

2/18/75
SF
P85.35
#1

DOCUMENTS
FEB 13 1975
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

February 18, 1975

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 16, 1974 Meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

3. (75-1) Electrical Testing Laboratories, Inc. Request for approval as independent testing laboratory for safety and performance testing and certification, labeling and listing of products as specified in San Francisco Electrical Code (Section 75, San Francisco Electrical Code). Electrical Testing Laboratories, Inc.

4. (75-2) Notre Dame Apartments, NE Corner Broadway and Van Ness Avenue. Request for Variance re: location of detectors of products of combustion (Section 1309, San Francisco Building Code). Maisin Development Corporation; Corwin Booth & Associates, Architects.

cc: City Librarian

SF Dept of Public Works
2/18/75
SF
385.35
#2
DOCUMENTS
MAR 1 3 1975
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING

February 18, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Degenkolb, Gendler, Stoeckle, Lera (For Item 75-1).

Secretary: A Goldberg
Fire Dept. Repr.: Insp. J. Gustafson

MEMBERS ABSENT Messrs. Hatch, Raffin, Oliphant

TAPE 93
SIDE 2

800 Meeting called to order by Mr. Degenkolb at 7:25 p.m. Agenda adopted unanimously. Minutes of meeting of December 16, 1974 adopted unanimously as written.

805 Mr. Goldberg advised Board of problems created as a result of opinion by City Attorney's office in regard to potential conflict of interest. The opinion resulted from question raised by Mr. Raffin. The effect would inevitably be successive resignation of virtually every member of the Board within a short time with us feasible way of replacing with equivalent competence.

940 Mr. Gendler moved that Mr. Goldberg notify and advise Board of Supervisors and other interested parties of the problem.

950 Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 3. (75-1) ELECTRICAL TESTING LABORATORIES, INC. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL AS INDEPENDENT TESTING LABORATORY FOR SAFETY AND PERFORMANCE TESTING AND CERTIFICATION, LABELING AND LISTING OF PRODUCTS AS SPECIFIED IN SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE (SECTION 75, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE). ELECTRICAL TESTING LABORATORIES, INC.

960 Mr. Goldberg described the request as well as the general criteria for acceptance for approval as independent testing laboratory. The submitted documentation apparently is lacking in many respects such as listing, follow-up and de-listing if appropriate.

1050 Maitland questioned if procedure would be available for possible follow-up field labeling of inadvertently unlabeled products.

Gustafson, of SFFD, had no comment if equivalent to U.L.

1060 Mr. Pracejus, of Electrical Testing Laboratories, discussed most of the questions raised by Mr. Goldberg and submitted document: "Listing and Labeling Services." He stated that labeling was not possible until recently due to legal restrictions..

1140 Mr. Degenkolb requested a summary of history of ETL as well of the organizational structure and operational practices.

1150 Mr. Pracejus stated that ETL has been employee-owned since 1940's, has been doing testing of cable, acoustical products, carpet and electrical products for many years.

1210 Mr. Pracejus is now requesting acceptance for "cable." Expectation is that next items may be large air conditioners and medical equipment. ETL policy would not be to write standards, but rather to use appropriate national standards.

1350 Mr. Gendler asked whether ETL was testing for safety or for industry product control.

1390 (and 93)
TAPE 94
SIDE 1

010 Mr. Pracejus stated that percentage of items tested for safety is now very small; most testing is now for performance. However, safety testing has been started only recently due to previous proprietary restrictions. He assured that appropriate expertise would be developed before safety testing and labeling would be started in any field.

045 Mr. Goldberg emphasized that testing for safety should be per UL Standards rather than per ANSI.

055 Mr. Pracejus narrowed his request to following four items:

UL 1072	Cable
UL 544	Medical Equipment
UL 542	Fluorescent Starters
	Large Air Conditioners

060 Messrs. Degenkolb and Gendler questioned extent of proposed follow-up program, particularly in San Francisco.

070 Mr. Pracejus reviewed ETL follow-up method for cable witness checking, as well as controls for radio equipment. Performance testing is basically four times per year.

100 Mr. Pracejus indicated that any follow-up in San Francisco would presently have to be handled from New York.

250 Mr. Lera moved that ETL be recognized as an approved independent testing laboratory for items to be determined; that authority to label certain specific products be sought by submission of detailed testing and follow-up procedures for the specific products; that the specific requests be referred back to the Board, and a procedure be submitted for verification of listed items which may appear in San Francisco with lost or missing labels.

280 Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 4. (75-2) NOTRE DAME APARTMENTS, NE CORNER BROADWAY AND VAN NESS AVENUE. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: LOCATION OF DETECTORS OF PRODUCTS OF COMBUSTION (SECTION 1309, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). MAISIN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION; CORWIN BOOTH & ASSOCIATES, ARCHITECTS.

285 Mr. Goldberg outlined request to substitute detectors in corridors for detectors within dwelling units of an apartment house, as failing to provide the safety required by Sec. 1309 of the San Francisco Building Code.

310 Mr. Gustafson, of SFFD, concurred with Mr. Goldberg and emphasized that detectors must be in rooms to be effective in protection of life.

320 Mr. Rosso, of Maisin Development Co., described the unique living arrangements of the project as congregate living. He stated that there would be full-time personnel in attendance within the building. Additionally each unit will have two manually operated alarm buttons, and building is incombustible construction. Residents will be age 62 and up and are expected to do little cooking in their rooms.

420 Mr. Goldberg outlined history of Code requirement, noting that the particular hazards arise in the living areas before retiring, generally due to cooking, smoking, TV sets, etc.

450 Mr. Rosso reiterated that the recreation facilities would generally be outside the sleeping rooms, and that many other compensating safety elements exist.

480 Additionally, cost of the detectors plus connected alarm system is excessive.

485 Mr. Goldberg and Insp. Gustafson noted that connection to alarm system is not required by Sec. 1309. The required protection can be achieved by installing individual detectors within each of the rooms, so that the alarm will sound within the room to awaken anyone present.

505 Mr. Statner, Electrical Contractor, suggested that this item be continued so that the questions raised could be investigated.

520 Mr. Rosso requested continuation of the item.

525 Meeting adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:da
cc: City Librarian

4.28.75
SF
P85.35
#2

SF Public Library

DOCUMENTS
JUL 1 1975
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

April 28, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Degenkolb, Gendler, Hatch, Lera, Oliphant, Stoeckle.
Secretary: Mr. Goldberg.
Fire Dept. Representative: Jack Gustafson.

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

TAPE 94
SIDE 2

000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Oliphant at 7:05 p.m.

008 Agenda adopted. Sequence of Items will be 5, 6, 4.

011 Minutes of Board of Examiners meeting of February 18, 1975, and April 23, 1975, adopted.

ITEM 5 (75-4). WATERFRONT APARTMENTS - LOMBARD AND CHESTNUT STREETS, APPLICATION NO. 422953-5. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE: TO INSTALL 1/4" COPPER TUBING FOR COLD WATER SUPPLY TO REFRIGERATORS (SEC. 1009, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE). CAHILL CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

012 Mr. Goldberg discusses Code requirements and intentions.

020 Mr. Goldberg states possible future maintenance problems for owners. Second and third owners may not be aware.

025 Mr. Gustafson states Fire Department has no objections.

027 Mr. Jim Bruno makes presentation for proponent.

039 Floor discussion closed. Board discussion.

052 Mr. Oliphant proposes protection for tubing.

056 Mr. Hatch notes that protection is not a question. Protection need not be any better for 1/2" diameter, if used.

074 Mr. Stoeckle stated it should not be less than 1/2" diameter.

084 Mr. Stoeckle moved for use of 3/8" inside diameter, with shut-off valve at take off tee.

091 Mr. Gendler clarified - Type L. Mr. Stoeckle agreed.

095 Motion adopted unanimously.

ITEM 6 (75-5). PONTE D'ORO RESTAURANT - V EMBARCADERO CENTER, APPLICATION NO. 444482. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE IN REGARD TO SIZE OF, AND HARDWARE FOR, A NON-REQUIRED EXIT DOOR (SEC. 3316.1 AND SEC. 3303, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH, INC.

096 Mr. Goldberg discussed requests:

1. Less than 5' width exits.
2. Sliding door for 2 exits (no panic hardware, no swing in exit direction).

Contention was that sliding doors would never be closed when restaurant is open for business.

102 Mr. Goldberg discussed Code requirements.

117 Mr. Goldberg was against request.

119 Mr. Gustafson also objected.

122 No proponents present - continue item.

ITEM 4 (75-3). ASTROPHYSICS RESEARCH CORPORATION. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE LSS-1100A FIRE/LIFE SAFETY SYSTEM AS A NEW METHOD AND MATERIAL (SEC. 1807, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE; ARTICLE 7, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE). ASTROPHYSICS RESEARCH CORPORATION.

127 Mr. Goldberg referred to letter and documents from proponents and Board.

137 Item is an approval request, not a variance.

150 Mr. Goldberg stated that tests had not been started, and Board would be approving an untested system.

154 No provisions for 2-way communication.

162 Mr. Gustafson stated that system could not be approved as Life Safety System until the State Fire Marshal has approved it.

168 Mr. Goldberg stated that buildings erected before 1973 are not covered by the State.

172 Mr. Goldberg stated that San Francisco will still require all systems to have San Francisco approval. State approval is not enough for new construction after July 1974.

179 Proponent #1: There are no locking devices on any of the stairwells; conduits are in for 2-way communication, but there is no wiring in place.

190 Proponent #2 discussed changes, questions and features of this system.

230 Exchange of technical questions and answers between Board and proponents.

245 Mr. Goldberg asked whether the tests that UL will, or does, perform require the same as what has already been done.

Answer implied that there are no present UL criteria. Proponents stated that it will conform to the requirements of Title 19.

259 Unidentified opponent requested time.

260 Request denied. No new situations, opponent had say last time.

264 Ad Hoc Committee of the Board of Examiners reported on field trip and non-compliance with Codes - mostly Chapter 7, Title 7 and Title 8.

272 Mr. Oliphant outlined several points as Electrical Code requirements which can be picked up by the Bureau of Building Inspection. Some points are components and these are under Board of Examiners jurisdiction.

311 Points B1, B2 and B3 come under Bureau of Building Inspection, Electrical Division. Board of Examiners highlighted areas for Bureau of Building Inspection to check.

350 Mr. Oliphant made a point that under certain circumstances, the system is not "Class A".

372 Recapitulation: Item 4A is OK
4B requires change
4C changed by proponent
4D changed by proponent

374 Therefore, only Item 4B needs to be acted on by the Board of Examiners.

378 Mr. Degenkolb proposed conditional approval, pending the testing now underway.

390 Proponents agreed to correct any deficiencies which the tests may reveal.

393 Mr. Goldberg: Continue approval until all test reports are in.

395 Mr. Degenkolb moved that:

1. One job approval be granted.
2. Conditional approval be granted, pending test results.
3. Bonding to correct any deficiencies revealed by the tests.

403 Proponents offered a $100,000 bond.

405 Tests are to be finished by June 1, 1975. Approval to be completed by January 1, 1976.

409 Bond is to be put in escrow. Copy to Mr. Goldberg.

411 Opponents want to go on record that opposition existed.

413 Motion adopted unanimously.

Mr. Lera leaves at 8:20 p.m.

Proponents of ITEM 6 had arrived at 7:35 p.m.

CONTINUATION OF ITEM 6 (75-5).

425 Mr. Goldberg again discussed Code requirements and objections.

435 Proponents gave presentation. No particularly important or mitigating circumstances were raised.

453 Mr. Hatch asked if doors could be bi-fold type and wider. Mr. Goldberg stated that he was also thinking the same thing.

Proponents stated it was possible, but not desirable.

468 Mr. Hatch noted that existing conditions are illegal.

478 Board discussion.

491 Mr. Hatch asked if door could be made wider and able to swing.

Proponents stated it would be very difficult with existing conditions.

505 Mr. Goldberg suggested a treadle-operated sliding door with breakaway feature.

521 Mr. Degenkolb suggested that one door be 4' wide and the other 5' wide. Both doors to have breakaway feature.

528 Mr. Degenkolb put his suggestion in the form of a motion.

532 Motion adopted unanimously.

535 Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Alfred Goldberg

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

FL:cg

cc: City Librarian

SF
P&S.35
#1
7-7-75
c.3

SF Dept of Building Inspection

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

July 7, 1975

DOCUMENTS
JUL 9 1975
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of April 28, 1975, Meeting

OLD BUSINESS

(74-17)

3. ~~(1654)~~ 1530 Leavenworth St. Appeal of Board of Examiners ruling of December 16, 1974, that it be the responsibility of the applicant of the applicant to provide conclusive proof, by professional review and report, that submitted calculations do comply with BMS 66; (Sec. 1009.E, San Francisco Plumbing Code). D. I. Chardbourne Inc.

(74-14, 15)

cancelled ~~(1654)~~ 530 Bush Street Fire Alarm Requirements. Request for rehearing on fire alarm system for building and review of previous decision of August 5, 1974; (Sec. 508, San Francisco Building Code). Storek & Storek Architecture.

NEW BUSINESS

4. (75-8) 114 Sansome Street, Adam Grant Building. Request for variance to add vertical extension to subject building. (Sec. 104.D and 104.F, San Francisco Building Code). Cushman & Wakefield.

5. (75-9) 600 Montgomery Street, Transamerica Headquarters Building. Request for interpretation, extension of stairway presently connecting 11th and 12th floors of building to 13th floor; (Article 3308A, San Francisco Building Code). Gensler and Associates/Architects.

6. (75-10) 1142 Van Ness Avenue, Concordia/Argonaut Club. Request for approval of PVC pipe for use in swimming pool; (Administrative Bulletin A-9). Sunkist Pools Inc.

cc: City Librarian

SF Dept of Public Works
DOCUMENTS
JUL 21 1975
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

July 7, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Hatch, Oliphant, Stoeckle, Degenkolb, and Balling (for ITEM 6).
Secretary: Mr. Goldberg

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Gendler

TAPE 94
SIDE 2

000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Oliphant at 7:15 p.m. Agenda adopted. Item 74-14, 15 dropped from Agenda, Mr. Goldberg indicated matter will be handled by his office. Minutes of Board of Examiners meeting of April 28, 1975, adopted, however, Mr. Hatch asked for verification of posting of $100,000 bond for ITEM 4. Mr. Goldberg to check. (Has been verified - see copy attached).

017 ITEM 3 (74-17). 1530 LEAVENWORTH STREET. APPEAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS RULING OF DECEMBER 16, 1974, THAT IT BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO PROVIDE CONCLUSIVE PROOF, BY PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AND REPORT, THAT SUBMITTED CALCULATIONS DO COMPLY WITH BMS 66; (SEC. 1009.E, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE). D. I. CHADBOURNE INC.

No proponents present.

031 Mr. Goldberg recommends sustaining ruling of December 16, 1974, no new data or facts since then to justify an appeal.

041 Mr. Degenkolb motions appeal be continued until next meeting; if appellants do not appear, then deny appeal for further hearing, sustain prior ruling.

043 Motion adopted unanimously.

047 ITEM 4 (75-8). 114 SANSOME STREET, ADAM GRANT BUILDING. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE TO ADD VERTICAL EXTENSION TO SUBJECT BUILDING. (SEC. 104.D AND 104.F, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD.

050 Mr. Goldberg discusses item.

078 Mr. Jaime Villarroel, S.E., acknowledges building was not designed to have frame action resisting lateral forces, but gives his opinion that the steel frame has some such capacity. He notes that additional weight will be small, and the building was designed for eight more floors.

110 Applicant circulates some photos and layout plans of existing and proposed conditions and locations.

125 Mr. Degenkolb voices opinion that proposed work is not a vertical extension. If mechanical equipment, which accounts for most of the new weight, were left exposed instead of roofed over, then there would be no variance required.

143 Mr. Degenkolb motions that variance be granted. Motion passed unanimously.

150 Mr. Degenkolb and Mr. Goldberg agree that this variance can be used as a guideline by the Bureau of Building Inspection for similar situations in the future.

153 ITEM 5 (75-9). 600 MONTGOMERY STREET, TRANSAMERICA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING. REQUEST FOR INTERPRETATION, EXTENSION OF STAIRWAY PRESENTLY CONNECTING 11TH AND 12TH FLOORS OF BUILDING TO 13TH FLOOR; (ARTICLE 3308A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). GENSLER AND ASSOCIATES/ ARCHITECTS.

Mr. Goldberg discusses problem, historical interpretations. Mr. Goldberg opposes request, says it would create a 3-story chase.

175 Mr. Goldberg notes that sprinklers were part of original life-safety trade-off for building, and should not be given credit again here.

180 Proponent (Mr. Claudius, Gensler and Associates) makes presentation.

213 Second proponent suggests a smoke screen at 11th floor as additional offer (escalator type).

228 Mr. Goldberg notes the roll-down steel fire door does not comply with temperature transmittal requirements of E119 and Sec. 4306.D.

260 Mr. Goldberg acknowledges that temperature transmittal concept originally had in mind situation where fire is on floor side, and heat would hamper occupants exiting down stairs. Here, the situation is reversed.

285 Mr. Oliphant states that a roll-down door is an excellent smoke sieve, not smoke barrier.

300 Mr. Degenkolb suggests a vestibule and an additional fire door at the 13th floor. Mr. Goldberg says this would require 7' ± encroachment into floor space.

345 Mr. Degenkolb motions that:

1. Extend sprinklers.

2. 2-Hr. shaft construction.

3. Smoke curtain (escalator type) at 11th floor.

4. 1-1/2 Hr. roll-down door, vestibule, 1-1/2 Hr. door at 13th floor.

Wants on record that this is one-time approval, and only because building has life-safety system.

355 Motion passed unanimously.

360 ITEM 6 (75-10). 1142 VAN NESS AVENUE, CONCORDIA/ARGONAUT CLUB. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PVC PIPE FOR USE IN SWIMMING POOL; (ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN A-9). SUNKIST POOLS INC.

Mr. Balling joins the Board.

Mr. Goldberg states opposition to plastic pipe, past approvals for DWV use made over Mr. Goldberg's objections. No new developments to change his stand.

390 Mr. Goldberg states that plastic pipe has never been allowed to penetrate a 4-Hr. firewall.

400 President of Sunkist Pools makes presentation. Plumbing contractor describes conditions, gives opinion. Mr. Bolles, Architect, gives opinion.

485 Mr. Goldberg says there are two issues here.

1. Use of plastic pipe.

2. Penetration of 4-Hr. wall.

505 Plumbing contractor states about 300' pipes installed. All but 40' ± will be enclosed in a chase of metal lath and plaster construction.

570 Mr. Degenkolb says cannot approve plastic, but this appears to be a hardship case.

585 Contractor says opening in 2-ft. thick brick wall is about 24" diameter. Five pipes going through - from 1-1/2" diameter to 4" diameter.

600 Mr. Goldberg suggests alternate method: provide 2-Hr. chase enclosure and fill inside volume with vermiculite concrete.

640 Mr. Degenkolb motions:

1. Plastic pipe outside boiler room enclosed with 2-Hr. construction in the boiler room, 1-Hr. in the pool area.

2. Within 3-ft. of wall penetration, either change to metal piping, or use vermiculite concrete fill for the entire boiler room enclosure.

3. Last 3-ft. within boiler room shall be in metal pipe extending from enclosure.

4. One-time hardship case.

664 Motion unanimously passed.

668 Mr. Goldberg discusses item not on Agenda - approval of foam plastics.

Two reports will be coming out - FTC and UL. (Will be out in two weeks.)

Mr. Oliphant motions that hearing on this matter be held as soon as possible.

Motion unanimously passed.

Next meeting set for September 8, 1975, on the foam plastics.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Alfred Goldberg

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

FL:cg

cc: City Librarian

SF
Dept. of Public Works

SF
P85.35
#1
12-3-75

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

December 3, 1975

DOCUMENTS
DEC 1 1975
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of October 20, 1975 Meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

3. (74-17) 1530 Leavenworth St. Appeal of Board of Examiners ruling of December 16, 1974, that it be the responsibility of the applicant to provide conclusive proof, by professional review and report, that submitted calculations do comply with BMS 66; (Sec. 1009.E, San Francisco Plumbing Code). D. I. Chardbourne Inc.

4. (75-13) Trus Joist TJI - One Hour fire resistance rating. Request for approval of new method of construction. (Sec. 4302.B, San Francisco Building Code). Trus Joist Corporation.

5. (75-16) Golden Gate (Park) Equestrian Center. Request for Variance, to use a fabric-roofed shed as riding rink (Sec. 1501.1 and Sec. 3201, SF Building Code.

6. (75-3) Astrophysics Research Corporation. Request for approval of the LSS-1100A Fire/Life Safety System as a new method and material; (Sec. 1807, San Francisco Building Code; Article 7, San Francisco Electrical Code. Astrophysics Research Corporation.

NEW BUSINESS

7. (75-17) 3 Kearny St.(Fidelity Savings Building). Request for Variance, Horizontal Force Factor for bracing of parapet walls (Table No. 23-I and Section 2314.D.2, San Francisco Building Code). Ira S. Kessey, Engineering Consultant.

SF

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

December 3, 1975

SF P85.35 #2 12-3-75

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Degenkolb, Hatch, Gendler, Cammisa (and Mr. Balling for Item 74-17.)
Fire Dept. Representative: Chief Condon
Secretary: Mr. Goldberg

MEMBERS ABSENT: Messrs. Stoeckle, Lera

TAPE 95
Side 2

500 Meeting called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Mr. Gendler, who was elected chairman unanimously.

Agenda adopted, with Item 4 to be heard as second item of business since applicant was from out of City, and Item 7 as first item business as it may be only a brief referral.

Minutes of October 20, 1975 meeting adopted unanimously as written.

515 Mr. Gendler outlined general Board procedures.

ITEM 3. (75-17) 3 KEARNY ST. (FIDELITY SAVINGS BUILDING). REQUEST FOR VARIANCE, HORIZONTAL FORCE FACTOR FOR BRACING OF PARAPET WALLS (TABLE NO. 23-I AND SECTION 2314.D.2, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). IRA S. KESSEY, ENGINEERING CONSULTANT.

525 Mr. Goldberg described the request as follows:

This is first parapet enforcement variance request. Though this case is of an unusual nature, it is our position that we will need considerable guidance and support for developing a set of guidelines for structural criteria to provide for reasonable interpretation of compliance with Art. 2.5 of the Building Code. In order to best do this and not place an undue burden upon the sole structural engineer member of the Board, in the past we have sought and obtained a panel of structural engineers to act as advisory members to the Board. These have served without compensation, recommended by the Executive Board of SEAONC.

I therefore recommend that such assistance be sought from SEAONC and that the Bureau of Building Inspection develop with them criteria to be used for adoption by Board of Examiners. I have checked with the City Attorney's office

and have confirmed that such authority to create guidelines having the force of law are within our discretionary powers, so long as they are reasonably based upon the code intent and latitude, and they are properly published and available to the public.

Applicant has indicated that there is no time constraint upon his request, and that he is willing to wait for such criteria as may be established.

545 Chief Condon, of S.F. Fire Department, had no further comment.

548 Mr. Ira Kessey agreed that matter was unusual and could await report by advisory committee.

550 Mr. Hatch moved to contact the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California to establish a special advisory committee per Superintendent's recommendations.

553 Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 4. (75-13) TRUS JOIST TJI - ONE HOUR FIRE RESISTANCE RATING. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF NEW METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION. (SEC. 4302.B, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). TRUS JOIST CORPORATION.

556 Mr. Goldberg gave history of previous hearing on this item.

600 Chief Condon concurred with Superintendent, and stated that control of fall-off is important to the Fire Department.

Mr. Z. Mills, of Trus Joist Corp., read Sec. 4302.B of the S.F. Building Code, and stated that he believed that only Sec. 4302.B should be applied rather than also Sec. 106. He stated that he believed that Code requirements had been met.

655 Board discussion.

745 Mr. Marshall, of Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Co., discussed application of building code requirements to fire-tested assemblies. He considered that Sec. 106 was not applicable as part of review of fire test required by Art. 43.

800 Discussion of structural resistance requirements of Art. 47.

830 Mr. Degenkolb moved denial of request, based on excessive amount of fall-off.

835 Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 5. (74-17) 1530 LEAVENWORTH ST. APPEAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS RULING OF DECEMBER 16, 1974, THAT IT BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO PROVIDE CONCLUSIVE PROOF, BY PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AND REPORT, THAT SUBMITTED CALCULATIONS DO COMPLY WITH BMS 66; (SEC. 1009.E, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE). D.I. CHADBOURNE INC.

845 Mr. Goldberg cited history of this request and referred to applicant's letter dated 11/13/75, in which he asked that request be changed from an interpretation to a variance. He further stated that there was no basis for a variance inasmuch as engineer's calculations have not been submitted nor equivalent safety proven.

875 Mr. Lewis, Chief Plumbing Inspector, described the installed system as being undersized and contained a 1¼" pressure reducing valve, even though the system was mainly 2" size.

890 Mr. Chadbourne, Jr. described his request as stated in his letter of 11/13/75. He stated that the calculations which he had submitted should be considered as being technical data rather than engineering design calculations for which an engineer's review would be required.

985 Mr. Hatch noted the long lapse of time between the December 1974 hearing and the July meeting which applicant failed to attend, and then the further lapse to December 1975. He stated that applicants have the responsibility to actively pursue their cases to final conclusion.

1016 Mr. Degenkolb moved denial of this request for variance and confirmed their decision of 12/16/74.

1020 Board adopted unanimously.

ITEM 6. (75-3) ASTROPHYSICS RESEARCH CORPORATION. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE LSS-1100A FIRE/LIFE SAFETY SYSTEM AS A NEW METHOD AND MATERIAL; (SEC. 1807, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE; ARTICLE 7, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE.) ASTROPHYSICS RESEARCH CORPORATION.

1025 Mr. Goldberg reviewed history of the approval granted by the Board on April 28, 1975.

1060 Mr. William Earl, of Rosendin Electric, stated that the system has been functioning successfully continuously. He also stated that the tests by Viking Lab were now about 45% complete. Progress has been slow because of the difficulties inherent in pioneering work in a new area of system development.

1105 Chief Condon described results of a recent inspection of the building indicating an acceptable level of safety. However, since the system has not as yet been listed by the State Fire Marshall and Underwriters Labs, Inc., formal approval and conformance with the established criteria is essential.

1130 Board discussion.

1160 Mr. Hatch noted the excessive amount of delay in completion of the testing.

1185 Chief Condon stated that Fire Dept. had no objection to a 90-day time extension.

1200 Mr. Hatch recognized the favorable comments by the Fire Dept. and moved granting of 90-day time extension for completion.

Board adopted unanimously.

Next meeting set for January 26, 1976.

1225 Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:dm
cc: City Librarian
Board of Examiners
Fire Dept. - Chief Condon

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION

MEETING

SUBJECT: BOARD OF EXAMINERS

DATE: December 3, 1975

NAME	ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS
C P Guilbeault	Casewell Elec SF CA
W R Earl	" " "
[illegible]	[illegible]
R.J. Centofante	Astrophysics Res Corp S.F.C.A.
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
Jorge L Arnal	Jorge de Quesada Inc. S.F.
Zimri Mills	Trus Joist Corp Boise, Idaho
[illegible]	[illegible]
James R. Carty	Trus Joist Systems
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
Randy Finn	National Gypsum Company Richmond, Calif.
K. S ELESON	NATIONAL GYPSUM CO. P.O. BOX 1888, LONG BEACH, CA 908
E.A. Sorensen	1411 Stockton St. S.F.

CITY LIBRARIAN
SF Public Works
1-26-76
SF
P85.35
#1

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

January 26, 1976

DOCUMENTS
JAN 2 6 1976
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 3, 1975 meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

3. (72-17) "Audio-Fire-Alert" Evacuation Alarm System. Request for further extension of approval granted on July 10, 1972. By Harry Goodwater, President, Audio-Alert Company.

NEW BUSINESS

4. (76-1) Waterfront, Phase I, block bounded by Montgomery, Chestnut, Sansome and Lombard. Request for Variance re: Pipe penetrations through 4-hour rated reinforced concrete garage ceiling slab. (Sec. 503.C & Sec. 4305.B, San Francisco Building Code). Bull Field Volkmann Stockwell, Architecture.

5. (76-2) 45 Fremont Street (Bechtel II). Request for Variance re: Organic coating on aluminum less than ½" in thickness. (Sec. 2801.1 and Sec. 2805.1, San Francisco Building Code). Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Architects.

6. (76-3) Fentron Aluminum Wall Panels. Request for Approval of a New Method of Construction: Exterior curtain wall panel system of honeycomb aluminum construction as incombustible unrated wall. (Sec. 1801; Sec. 1701.2; Table No. 17-A, San Francisco Building Code). Fentron Industries, Inc.

7. (76-4) Jefferson, Leavenworth, Hyde (Wharf Park) Application No. 452813. Request for Variance re: Public assembly B-3 occupancy on third floor of Type 5, 1-hour building. (Sec. 507 and Table No. 5-E, San Francisco Building Code). Gensler and Associates/Architects.

SF Public Works
1/26/76
SF
P85.35
#2

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

January 26, 1976

DOCUMENTS
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler, Hatch, Cammisa, Degenkolb (and Mr. Lera for Item 72-17 only)

Mr. Kastius, Acting Secretary
Capt. Engler, Fire Department
Mr. Fong, Bldg. Plans Engineer, Bureau of Building Inspection

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Goldberg

TAPE 96
Side 1

000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 7:05 p.m.

Agenda adopted unanimously.

Minutes of December 3, 1975 meeting adopted unanimously as written.

ITEM 3. (72-17) "AUDIO-FIRE-ALERT" EVACUATION ALARM SYSTEM. REQUEST FOR FURTHER EXTENSION OF APPROVAL GRANTED ON JULY 10, 1972. BY HARRY GOODWATER, PRESIDENT, AUDIO-ALERT COMPANY.

022 Mr. Kastius stated basic reason for provisional approval as being lack of formal test procedures formulated by UL. Recommended additional extension of approval.

029 Capt. Engler expressed no objection to extension.

030 Mr. Degenkolb moved that the approval be extended one year.

Motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 4. (76-1) WATERFRONT, PHASE I, BLOCK BOUNDED BY MONTGOMERY, CHESTNUT, SANSOME AND LOMBARD. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: PIPE PENETRATIONS THROUGH 4-HOUR RATED REINFORCED CONCRETE GARAGE CEILING SLAB. (SEC. 503.C & SEC. 4305.B, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). BULL FIELD VOLKMANN STOCKWELL, ARCHITECTURE.

035 Mr. Kastius discussed aspects of variance request and requirement of 4-hour separation and penetration thereof. Conditional approval granted by Bureau of Building Inspection; however, construction did not proceed accordingly.

TAPE 96
Side 1

042 Mr. Fong discussed aspects of particular job and requirement for 4-hour slab. Sec. 4305.B gives exceptions and refers to Sec. 1706.A for shaft enclosure requirement. Code Ruling 68-4 applies only to 2-hour slab.

065 Mr. Kastius stated that equivalence was granted by Mr. Goldberg.

070 Mr. Fong read following letters to the Board:

1. Bureau of Building Inspection to Montgomery & Roberts, 11-14-74; conditional 1-job approval of 4-hour penetration.

2. Bureau of Building Inspection to Montgomery & Roberts, 9-5-75; Code Ruling 68-4 applies only to 2-hour slabs.

085 Paul Meade (of Bull Field / Volkmann Stockwell) discussed history of request, asserting that the construction proceeded based on interpretation given by Mr. Campos, District Building Inspector. Emphasized extra thickness of slab and full sprinklering of basement and first floor.

103 Mr. Kastius expressed regret over Mr. Campos' decision, and stated the Bureau is not bound by such a decision if contrary to Code intent. Mr. Campos may not have been aware of the 4-hour slab requirement.

123 Capt. Engler stated that sprinklers are required anyway, so cannot use twice.

148 Mr. Kastius stated that the greater than ordinary thickness of slab is a plus factor.

150 Board discussion on types of pipes, number and size of penetrations, status of construction, spray-on, packing of openings, pipe protection, etc. Approximately 1000 penetrations; about 1/3 of slabs, 20" thick and other 2/3, 11½" thick.

230 Mr. Degenkolb moved that variance be granted with the following conditions:

1. For 20" slabs, pack full thickness
2. For 11½" slabs, pack full thickness and add about 8½" of high temperature packing on pipe below slab
3. Applicant to summarize locations of slab thicknesses and define packing material to be used.

Motion passed unanimously.

TAPE 96
Side 1

ITEM 5. (76-2) 45 FREMONT STREET (BECHTEL II). REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: ORGANIC COATING ON ALUMINUM LESS THAN ⅛" IN THICKNESS. (SEC. 2801.1 AND SEC. 2805.1, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). SKIDMORE, OWINGS & MERRILL, ARCHITECTS.

245 Mr. Kastius stated the Bureau position that equivalence has not been established and discussed various points of comparison. Abrasion resistance equivalence has not been proven.

280 Mr. McCrary (Skidmore, Owings & Merrill) discussed merits of fluoropolymer material for coating aluminum. Falling Sand Test shows better wearing ability for organic coating.

300 Mr. McCann (Pennwalt Corp.) gave some background on Pennwalt and discussed merits of organic coating. He presented comparative test samples for Impact Resistance, Sand Abrasion, Chemical Spot Test, Salt Spray, Weather-ometer and Florida Exposure Test (6 years). Tests indicate superiority of "Kynar 500" in durability, weathering and fungus resistance. Except for Florida test, test programs are accelerated testing type.

426 Mr. Hatch asked if any testing has been done by an independent testing laboratory. Mr. McCann indicated that accelerated test series were performed "in-house", and that testing by an independent laboratory is under consideration.

440 Mr. O'Keeffe (O'Keeffe's, Inc.) introduced himself as a licensed applicator of fluorocarbon in the Western Region. Discussed metal preparation procedures as complex and involved, and expense of setting up operations.

500 Discussion on cost comparison between anodizing and organic coating, toxicity of released gases, current status of job, and code intent for anodizing requirement. Significant code change in 1973 as regards aluminum.

600 Mr. Degenkolb moved that approval be granted for this job only, subject to presentation of results of official ASTM testing by independent testing laboratories and submission of information on thermal breakdown and release of toxic gases.

Motion passed unanimously.

TAPE 96
Side 1

ITEM 6. (76-3) FENTRON ALUMINUM WALL PANELS. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A NEW METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION: EXTERIOR CURTAIN WALL PANEL SYSTEM OF HONEYCOMB ALUMINUM CONSTRUCTION AS INCOMBUSTIBLE UNRATED WALL. (SEC. 1801; SEC. 1701.2; TABLE NO. 17-A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). FENTRON INDUSTRIES, INC.

615 Mr. Kastius described curtain wall assembly. Submitted test data indicates significant delamination under fire conditions. Apparent breakdown of resin bonding. Hazard of fire spread. Bureau's conclusion is that the assembly does not have safety equivalence.
Fire protection of attaching clips and sealing of space between floor and curtain wall not provided.

660 Mr. Kiphart (Heath Tecna Corp.) described merits of assembly:

1. Significant weight reduction
2. Reduction of U factor
3. Distortion free

690 Mr. Hatch stated that the fire test was done on 4'x5' panels and not on a complete assembly. Does not consider this a fair test. Questioned adequacy of anchorage system to accommodate thermal expansion for high temperatures behind panel in case of fire.

750 Board discussion of panel thickness, fire protection of attachments and abutting members, comparison to ½" aluminum plate, and flame spread between floors.

840 Mr. McCrary stated that 3/16" to 1/4" plates are anchored similarly and there is no requirement to protect this aluminum in conventional window wall system.

Long length of panels with many attachments mentioned as a plus factor.

880 Mr. Hatch reiterated necessity for system testing.

Board discussion of equivalence of panels to sheet aluminum with respect to delamination, effectiveness of glueing, quick melt-off during fire.

1000 Mr. Degenkolb suggested that Board action be deferred pending additional information receipt. Building Department should inform Board on whether prior approvals of similar assemblies given and basis for such.

TAPE 96
Side 1

1010 Mr. Hatch moved for continuance.

1120 Mr. Kiphart made plea for acceptance for 1-job approval because of February 9, 1976 construction contractual deadline commitment.

1150 Mr. Hatch's motion for continuance passed unanimously. In consideration of the deadline problem, a Special Meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, February 3, 1976, 4:00 p.m. at 450 McAllister Streer, Room 202 or 605.

ITEM 7 (76-4) JEFFERSON, LEAVENWORTH, HYDE, (WHARF PARK) APPLICATION NO. 452813. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: PUBLIC ASSEMBLY B-3 OCCUPANCY ON THIRD FLOOR OF TYPE 5, 1-HOUR BUILDING. (SEC. 507 AND TABLE NO. 5-E, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). GENSLER AND ASSOCIATES, ARCHITECTS.

1180 Mr. Kastius defined variance request.

1190 Capt. Engler stated that San Francisco Building Code does not permit B-3 occupancy over two stories. State Title 19 has similar restriction except that increase of one story permitted provided automatic fire sprinklers added.

1206 Mr. Edelstein (Gensler & Associates) stated that a literal interpretation of two or three stories is a technicality, inasmuch as 2nd floor exits to grade, building height is 22', fire safety not compromised and ample exiting provided.

1235 Board discussion on area coverage, exiting arrangement and Title 19 requirements.

TAPE 96
Side 2

025 Mr. Fong referred to Sec. 507, San Francisco Building Code, which states that if entire building is sprinklered, one story can be added. However, Sec. 507 refers to Table 5-D but not Table 5-E. Therefore, restaurant still limited to 2nd floor per Code.

030 Mr. Edelstein stated only technicality involved.

TAPE 96
Side 2

045 Mr. Degenkolb moved to grant variance provided supervised sprinkler system be installed for entire building. Egress arrangement to be worked out with the Building Department and Fire Department.

Motion passed unanimously.

Next meeting of the Board to be a Special Meeting to consider Item 6 (76-3) only, for Tuesday, February 3, 1976 4:00 p.m. at 450 McAllister Street, Room 202 or 605.

055 Meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

William A Kastins
for Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

MC:dm
cc: City Librarian
Board of Examiners
Fire Dept. - Chief Condon

SF Public Works

2/3/76
SF
P85.35
#2

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

Special Meeting - February 3, 1976

DOCUMENTS
FEB 10 1976
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler, Hatch, Debenkolb, Cammisa

Mr. Goldberg, Secretary
Capt. Engler, Fire Department

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

TAPE 96
Side 2

056 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 4:05 P.M.

Mr. Gendler noted that this is a Special Meeting for Fentron request, which had been continued from the January 26, 1976, meeting.

ITEM 1. (76-3) FENTRON ALUMINUM WALL PANELS. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A NEW METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION: EXTERIOR CURTAIN WALL PANEL SYSTEM OF HONEYCOMB ALUMINUM CONSTRUCTION AS INCOMBUSTIBLE UNRATED WALL. (SEC. 1801; SEC. 1701.2; TABLE NO. 17-A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). FENTRON INDUSTRIES, INC.

065 Mr. Goldberg reviewed the request and also summarized applicable sections of the San Francisco Building Code: Sec. 1701.2; Tables Nos. 17A, B, C; Sec. 1801, Sec. 1807.2.

118 Capt. Engler (of San Francisco Fire Dept.) stated that Fire Dept. recognizes this type of assembly as curtain wall only and has no objection to approval provided all related code requirements are met, such as street width, density of sprinklering, fire-resistive backing and safing between curtain wall and structure.

196 Mr. Seeman (of Fentron) described request. The assembly has many esthetic and noise and energy insulating advantages as well as weight saving.

235 Mr. Goldberg asked if request was for a specific building.

240 Mr. Seeman stated that this request was for a general approval but they would provide anchorage and wind-strutting conforming with the San Francisco Building Code. Also, presented were a series of diagrams of details.

TAPE 96
Side 2

260 Mr. Seeman stated that mechanical stud attachments would be added, at rate of 8 to 11 per 40'x4½' panel, between exterior sheet and frame members.

285 Mr. Seeman cited physical testing of assembly.

305 Mr. Seeman described comparative fire testing as performed, using 1/4-inch aluminum panels as comparison standard.

320 Mr. Goldberg stated that the addition of stud connections made a significant difference in the request inasmuch as studs physically eliminate the possibility of delamination of the outer sheet.

Mr. Degenkolb noted that the Bureau was not accepting the connection details submitted as part of the approval request as there had not been a structural check made of these. Only the acceptance of the panel as exterior covering was at issue.

380 Mr. Cammisa moved, in the light of the modification presented, that request be tabled and referred back to Superintendent.

385 Board adopted unanimously.

387 Mr. Degenkolb moved that Bureau of Building Inspection and San Francisco Fire Dept. consult with the professional societies with the aim of reviewing the code sections relevant to curtain walls in regard to all aspects of fire safety.

430 Meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

William A Kostura
for Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:jp
cc: Board of Examiners
Fire Dept. - Chief Condon
City Librarian

4-15-76
SF
P85.35
#1

SF Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

April 19, 1976

DOCUMENTS
APR 4
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of January 26, 1976 meeting

3. Approval of Minutes of February 3, 1976 special meeting

OLD BUSINESS

4. (76-2) 45 Fremont Street (Bechtel II). Request for variance re: Organic coating on aluminum less than ½" in thickness. (Sec. 2801.1 and Sec. 2805.1, San Francisco Building Code). Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Architects.

5. (75-3) Astrophysics Research Corporation. Request for approval of the LSS-1100A Fire/Life Safety System as a new method and material. (Sec. 1807, San Francisco Building Code; Article 7, San Francisco Electrical Code). Astrophysics Research Corporation.

NEW BUSINESS

6. (76-5) 600 Montgomery Street (Transamerica Building). Request for variance re: Stairway penetration between 20th and 21st floors. (Sec. 3308.A, San Francisco Building Code). Morganelli-Heumann & Associates, Architects

OLD BUSINESS

7. (75-17) 3 Kearny St. (Fidelity Savings Building). Request for Variance, Horizontal Force Factor for bracing of parapet walls (Table No. 23-I and Section 2314.D.2, San Francisco Building Code). Ira S. Kessey, Engineering Consultant.

SF Public Works
4-19-76
SF
P85.35
#2
DOCUMENTS

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

April 19, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler, Hatch, Cammisa, Degenkolb (and Mr. Lera for Item 5 only)

Mr. Goldberg, Secretary
Chief Carli and Capt. Engler, Fire Department

MEMBERS ABSENT: Messrs. Kennedy, Whittaker

TAPE 96
Side 2

430 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 7:05 P.M.

Chief Carli, recently appointed to head Bureau of Fire Prevention, was introduced.

Agenda adopted unanimously, after moving 75-17 to Item 4, and 75-3 to Item 5.

445 Minutes of January 26, 1976 and February 3, 1976 meetings adopted unanimously.

ITEM 4. (75-17) REPORT OF PARAPET TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

450 Mr. Goldberg described history of the parapet safety question and general presentation made in December 1975.

480 Mr. Goldberg introduced members of the Parapet Technical Advisory Committe who were present.

494 Mr. Goldberg cited three additional items for possible consideration by the Board:

1. Proper course of procedure would be for Board to hear report of Chairman of Advisory Committee and act on their recommendations.

2. Consider the three items presented by the Bureau of Building Inspection as additions to Advisory Committee recommendations and act on each.

3. Consider overall guidelines including inspection outlined and possibly act on it.

Finally, by resolution, possibly empowering the Bureau of Building Inspection to use these composite

TAPE 96
Side 2

guidelines as the Board's interpretation of the intent of Article 2.5 insofar as the Board's evaluation and under the authority of the San Francisco Building Code.

505 Capt. Engler commented on Part 3, Item 7, to effect that notification of Fire Department be a requirement where fire escapes and standpipes are involved in any manner.

Mr. Goldberg noted that specific procedural problems could be resolved administratively.

517 Mr. Holmes, Chairman of the Parapet Technical Advisory Committee, reported on the deliberations and conclusions of the Committee and summarized the presented report.

603 Mr. Frank Lew concurred that the report by Mr. Holmes was an accurate summary of the Committee conclusions.

610 Mr. Goldberg called attention to the need for anchorage of the walls to the roof.

640 Mr. McCormick, AIA, stated that the three items added by the Bureau for consideration should be excluded. He also objected to Item 30A as creating excessive exposure to professional liabilities.

654 Mr. Al Rosenberg, AIA, elaborated on the reasons for exclusion of the three Bureau-recommended items. He also agreed with Mr. McCormick's objections to Item 30A. He also commented on the need for more detail regarding the roofing repair provisions.

680 Mr. Elmer Johnson, of the Building Owners and Managers Association, emphasized the urgent need of detailed interpretation information conveyance to owners who are under notice. He also asked for more time for response.

690 Mr. Goldberg noted that the matters before the Board were the technical guidelines, rather than the time frame. The Code was specific insofar as the time allowed was concerned

TAPE 96
Side 2

710 Mr. Lew stated, in response to question from Mr. Johnson, that 14 permits have been issued.

730 Mr. Hatch stated that additional time would be needed for his review. He suggested a special meeting.

750 Mr. Goldberg directed emphasis to the Committee Report rather than to the Bureau Bulletin.

760 Mr. Johnstone, representing City Planning and on the Parapet Advisory Task Force, also asked for more time to speak.

780 Mr. Degenkolb called attention to various items which he felt needed further consideration:

1. Steel-framed unreinforced masonry parapets.

2. Heavily plastered wood-frame cornices.

3. Need for bracing tops of walls from which parapets have been removed.

850 Mr. Hatch moved for continuance to 3:00 P.M., April 23, 1976, in Room 605, 450 McAllister.

865 Board adopted motion unanimously.

ITEM 5. (75-3) ASTROPHYSICS RESEARCH CORPORATION. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE LSS-1100A FIRE/LIFE SAFETY SYSTEM AS A NEW METHOD AND MATERIAL. (SEC. 1807, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE; ARTICLE 7, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE). ASTROPHYSICS RESEARCH CORPORATION.

890 Mr. Goldberg provided history and read the approval letter resulting from Board action on April 28, 1975. He further read the summary of report presented by Viking Laboratories and submitted by Rosendin Electric Company under date of April 16, 1976.

930 Capt. Engler noted that State Fire Marshal's approval may also be required.

955 Mr. Earl, of Rosendin Electric, stated that Fire Marshal's approval would be obtained within two to three weeks.

TAPE 96
Side 2

975 Capt. Engler clarified issue to effect that the system installed is a control of a Title 19 Fire Alarm System.

980 Mr. Degenkolb moved acceptance of report, discharge of bond and final conclusion of matter when advice is given to the Board of State Fire Marshal's acceptance of system.

1045 Board adopted motion unanimously.

ITEM 6. (76-2) 45 FREMONT STREET (BECHTEL II). REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: ORGANIC COATING ON ALUMINUM LESS THAN 1/4-INCH IN THICKNESS. (SEC. 2801.1 AND SEC. 2805.1, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). SKIDMORE, OWINGS & MERRILL, ARCHITECTS.

1050 Mr. Goldberg provided history of item and introduced report presented by the Pennwalt Corporation under date of February 6, 1976. He read pertinent excerpts relating to possible hazards due to thermal degradation products.

1090 Capt. Engler noted that Fire Department was not equipped to operate in chemically hazardous atmospheres and recommended against acceptance until proven safe.

1120 Mr. Larsen; of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill; stated his belief that Board had indeed granted a one-job approval on January 26, 1976 with no restricting conditions, such as submittal of further data. He discussed difficulties of evaluating toxicity of combustion products and read a letter from Dr. Irwin Benjamin dated December 30, 1975.

1290 Mr. Fisher, of S.O.M., expressed the need to evaluate the product in its appropriate context.

1320 Mr. Ronnie Lohr, of Pennwalt Corporation, stated that the cited cautions applied to bulk use of the materials, rather than to the 1-mil paint use.

1380 Capt. Engler asked questions:

1. What kind of hazard is created by emission of 1/4-pound of hydrogen fluoride gas?

TAPE 96
Side 2

2. What concentration, in parts per million, is likely to exist?

TAPE 97
Side 1

000

010 Mr. Goldberg discussed need to evaluate the dilution requirements to achieve safety.

035 Capt. Engler cited maximum tolerable concentration of HF as 3 ppm in air. (Handbook of Dangerous Materials by Sax.)

055 Mr. Goldberg again expressed need for expert data on tolerable concentrations along with dilution effects. Consideration must be given to possibility of an exterior exposure fire, breaking of windows, and thus entry of toxic gases into building.

130 Mr. Shuldiner, of Bechtel, stated that contract had been let for painted aluminum, based on Board approval of January 26, 1976.

160 Mr. Goldberg suggested review of tape to ascertain whether Board granted unconditional approval on January 26, 1976 on a one-job basis.

235 Mr. McCrary assured Board that S.O.M. would pursue questions on the table irrespective of results of review of tape

245 Item continued with stipulation that Board would sustain its decision of January 26, 1976 if the tape of the meeting indicated that the questions of tests and toxicity were with regard to a general approval and not the variance,

ITEM 7. (76-5) 600 MONTGOMERY STREET (TRANSAMERICA BUILDING). REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: STAIRWAY PENETRATION BETWEEN 20th & 21st FLOORS. (SEC. 3308.A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE.) MORGANELLI-HEUMANN & ASSOCIATES, ARCHITECTS.

250 Mr. Goldberg described request and cited a similar prior case (75-9). He also noted that Board action

TAPE 97
Side 1

may set precedent for similar future cases. He pointed out, however, that this specific case was not comparable to prior case insofar as construction and equivalent safety is concerned.

265 Capt. Engler noted that penetrations of 2-hour floor slabs could create conditions of overload on the calculated life-safety sprinkler system. He also called attention to possible hazard of a closed roll-down door at bottom of stair.

300 Mr. John Low, of Morganelli-Heumann & Associates, introduced:

305 Mr. Kanno, of M-H & Assoc., who referred to Sec. 3308.A of San Francisco Building Code and requested acceptance similar to escalator opening.

350 Mr. J. J. de Vrees, of Pyramid Investment Corporation, noted that the 3-story stair was not continuous.

360 Mr. Goldberg emphasized that plan-check Bureau conference notes and review correspondence is valid only when formally confirmed in writing by the Superintendent.

370 Mr. Goldberg stated that the primary hazard in a sprinklered building would be from smoke. Thus, the prior action of the Board in July 1975 was appropriate in that it gave consideration to the potential smoke problem. The proposed solution provides no such protection.

425 Mr. Goldberg stated, in response to question from Mr. Gendler, that additional enclosing walls and doors would be needed. Also, roll-down door would not be acceptable.

435 Mr. Edelstein questioned whether there had been any adverse experience in escalator-equipped buildings.

553 Mr. Degenkolb moved rejection of request as presented, but that Board would accept in principle an alternate solution, if presented by applicant, provided such alternate would include:

1. Enclosing walls, 1- or 2-hour fire rated or wire

TAPE 97
Side 1

glass in steel frames on 21st floor and continued upward to soffit of structural slab between 21st and 22nd floors.

2. Entry to downward stair on 21st floor protected by 3/4-hour door.

3. Recognition as a one-time variance only.

565 Board adopted motion unanimously.

Next regular meeting scheduled for May 3, 1976.

585 Meeting adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:cg

cc: City Librarian
Board of Examiners
SFFD - Chief Carli
Parapet Technical Advisory Committee

SF Public Works Documents CITY LIBRARIAN
4-23-76
SF
P85.35
#2

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING - PARAPET GUIDELINES

April 23, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler, Hatch, Cammisa, Degenkolb

Mr. Goldberg, Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT: Messrs. Kennedy, Whittaker

DOCUMENTS
MAY 6 1976
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

TAPE 97
Side 1

590 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 3:05 pm

Mr. Goldberg discussed history of the creation of the Bureau policy manual as well as the report of the Parapet Advisory Committee. He emphasized that the Board had no obligation in regard to approval of the Bureau manual, but should consider mainly the Committee report.

620 Mr. Holmes noted a correction to the Advisory Committee report in regard to "exclusion of cornices constructed entirely of wood." (Item 2. Cornices)

No further comments from Advisory Committee.

650 Mr. Degenkolb described his presented "Comments and Suggestions" which relate to the Parapet Advisory Committee report. He suggested that clear legal guideline separation must be drawn between hazardous parapets and appendages covered by Article 2.5, as opposed to other potentially dangerous portions of buildings not covered by the ordinance.

725 Mr. Goldberg noted, in connection with B. of the Suggestions, that definition of parapet included reference to anchorage of walls to roofs.

Discussion of anchorage for walls remaining below removed parapets.

770 Mr. Holmes noted that Mr. Degenkolb's Comments and Suggestions did not actually modify the Committee report significantly.

785 Further discussion of "anchorage."

830 Mr. Holmes noted that Committee view would be to consider anchorage of walls below removed parapets not covered by Article 2.5.

860 Mr. Goldberg suggested that "anchorage" be discussed further as part of the Bureau Guidelines.

865 Mr. Degenkolb discusses his Comment C.

900 Mr. Zacher, of H. J. Brunnier, commented that a steel-frame-enclosed parapet wall would be no more hazardous than steel-frame-enclosed wall panel below.

915 Mr. Holmes urged requirement of 0.2"g" for such parapet framing.

Further discussion of Degenkolb Comment C, with conclusion that 0.2"g" is acceptable, with possible further exceptions.

970 Mr. Degenkolb discussed his Comment D.

Board discussion of Comment D, with conclusion favoring acceptance.

1030 Discussion of Degenkolb Comment E, with conclusion that a cornice "near" top of wall should be included.

1080 Discussion of Degenkolb Comment F, generally acceptable.

1095 Mr. Degenkolb agreed with Committee re his Comment G.

1110 General Board discussion of Degenkolb Comments B through H relating to the Committee report.

1170 Mr. Degenkolb moved acceptance of Committee report, but with amendment to include:

> Comment B, provided at least minimal anchorage exists, such as dog-anchors at 64" maximum spacing.

1188 Comment D, essentially as written.

Comment F, with 1¼" maximum thickness of plaster.

1205 Seconded

1206 Adopted unanimously

1208 Mr. Goldberg discussed balustrades.

1220 Mr. Lew showed photographs of certain balustrades indicating segmental and disjointed condition of balustrade caps.

Discussion of balustrade hazards

TAPE 97
Side 1

1260 Mr. Holmes noted that Committee did not consider balustrades included in Article 2.5.

1270 Mr. Goldberg stated that balustrades and gargoyles should be included.

1280 Mr. Degenkolb said that "cantilevering" elements should be included.

1320 Mr. McCormick referred to Article 2.5 and noted that balustrades were not similar to statuary or tanks or cornices.

Further discussion of statuary and balustrade hazards.

1440 Mr. McCormick suggested exclusion of balustrades.

1460 Mr. Hatch moved that balustrades not be included for consideration under Article 2.5.

1473 Adopted unanimously

1480 Mr. Degenkolb moved that readily accessible balustrades be included in report to owner as an item of observation if there is no apparent continuous metal element in cap.

Seconded

1540 Adopted unanimously

1555 Discussion of possible hazards from chimneys.

1570 Mr. Holmes noted that Committee excluded chimneys unless they were part of a parapet.

1670 Mr. Cammisa moved that chimneys be excluded in line with Committee reports.

Seconded

1685 Two ayes, two noes

TAPE 97
Side 1

1695 Mr. Degenkolb moved, in regard to chimneys, adoption of wording of Item 20 in Bureau guidelines as revised to 4-23-76, but with exclusion of one and two-family dwellings and of H-occupancy wood frame buildings up to 4 stories in height.

1720 Mr. Gendler requested that any comments on the latest Bureau guidelines be mailed to Mr. Lew at 450 McAllister Street well in advance of May 3 for consideration of next meeting of Board scheduled for May 3, 1976.

1740 Mr. Hatch suggested that most of Part III of Bureau guidelines is of specification nature (cf. Comment EE by Degenkolb)

Discussion of minimum-quality specifications

1790 Further consideration of motion (tape 1695)

1804 Motion adopted unanimously

1810 Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:dm

cc: Board of Examiners
Members of Advisory Committee
Members of Parapet Task Force
City Librarian

SF
P85.35
#1
5-3-76

SF Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

May 3, 1976

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of April 19, 1976 meeting

NEW BUSINESS

3. (76-6) 1 Hallidie Plaza. Request for Variance re: Bus duct accessibility (Sec. 364.2, San Francisco Electrical Code). Integrand, by Robert Pincus.

4. (76-7) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street, between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Dead end depth of vertical aisle (Sec. 3321.F.4, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

5. (76-8) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street, between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Roof load, by electric scoreboard (Sec. 1806, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

6. (76-9) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Occupancy separation openings (Sec. 503.C, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

7. (76-10) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street, between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Rise between rows of seats (Sec. 3321.E.2, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

8. (76-11) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Life Safety Program - Elevator status display location (Sec. 1807.1.A.5.(b), San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

9. (76-12) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Doors - Magnetic hold-opens (Sec. 3309.C.4.A, San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

10. (76-13) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Doors - Omission drop of sills (Sec. 3309.C.4.A, San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

11. (76-14) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Penetrations of floors - Fire stop at telephone riser cables (Sec. 4305.B, San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

SF
P85.35
#1
5-3-76

SF Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

May 3, 1976

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of April 19, 1976 meeting

NEW BUSINESS

3. (76-6) 1 Hallidie Plaza. Request for Variance re: Bus duct accessibility (Sec. 364.2, San Francisco Electrical Code). Integrand, by Robert Pincus.

4. (76-7) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street, between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Dead end depth of vertical aisle (Sec. 3321.F.4, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

5. (76-8) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street, between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Roof load, by electric scoreboard (Sec. 1806, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

6. (76-9) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Occupancy separation openings (Sec. 503.C, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

7. (76-10) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center, 3rd Street, between Howard and Folsom Streets. Request for Variance re: Rise between rows of seats (Sec. 3321.E.2, San Francisco Building Code). Architects Associated.

8. (76-11) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Life Safety Program - Elevator status display location (Sec. 1807.1.A.5.(b), San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

9. (76-12) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Doors - Magnetic hold-opens (Sec. 3309.C.4.A, San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

10. (76-13) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Doors - Omission drop of sills (Sec. 3309.C.4.A, San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

11. (76-14) Embarcadero Center 232 Block, #3 Embarcadero Center. Request for Variance re: Penetrations of floors - Fire stop at telephone riser cables (Sec. 4305.B, San Francisco Building Code). John Portman & Associates.

SF Public Library

5/3/76

35

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

May 3, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler, Hatch, Cammisa, Degenkolb, Whittaker (and Mr. Lera for Item 76-3 only)

Mr. Goldberg, Secretary
Capt. Engler, Fire Department

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Kennedy

TAPE 97
Side 2

000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 7:05 p.m.

005 Mr. Hatch requested modification of agenda to add Minutes of January 26, 1976.

ITEM 2a. (76-15) PARAPET SAFETY GUIDELINES

015 Mr. Goldberg reviewed effect of actions of the Board upon the Bureau Guidelines. He summarized the various possible actions available to the Board in regard to these Guidelines.

045 Mr. Goldberg referred to a letter from Sullivan, Roche and Johnson, dated May 3, 1976, and advised Board that, if it took action favorable to request, it would substantially invalidate the last 10 months' work of the Bureau of Building Inspection Parapet Section.

070 Capt. Engler offered no comment for Fire Department.

075 Mr. McCormick referred to his previously offered comments in regard to required certifications by the design professional, per paragraph 30 of Bureau Guidelines. He also referred to paragraph 12 of Part I.

120 Board discussion of possible actions by Board in regard to Guidelines.

160 Mr. Holmes, of the Advisory Committee, noted that Special Inspection is generally not required for parapet work.

170 Mr. Kolb, of Sullivan, Roche and Johnson, commented on the burden of proof of inadequacy being on the Bureau of Building Inspection.

TAPE 97
Side 2

198 Mr. Rosenberg, AIA, suggested that the Board act along lines of adopting the Guidelines in principle, with exception of the professional liability question which Mr. Goldberg had suggested go to a special committee.

203 Mr. Elmer Johnson questioned whether the last revised Guidelines conformed to actions of the Board on April 23, 1976.

205 Mr. Degenkolb stated that revised Guidelines appeared to be in such conformance.

213 Mr. Hatch moved adoption of Guidelines in principle, with special consideration by a committee to review the professional's responsibility question and report back to the Board when resolved.

225 Mr. Gendler accepted for committee Messrs. Hatch, Rosenberg and Degenkolb, to work in consultation with City Attorney, as well as with attorneys for insurance carriers.

233 Seconded

235 Adopted unanimously

240 Board discussion of field inspection problems

ITEM 2b. (76-2) 45 FREMONT STREET (BECHTEL II). REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: ORGANIC COATING ON ALUMINUM LESS THAN ¼" IN THICKNESS. (SEC. 2801.1 AND SEC. 2805.1, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). SKIDMORE, OWINGS & MERRILL, ARCHITECTS.

275 Mr. Goldberg described problem resulting from review of tape of Minutes of January 26, 1976 in regard to validity of variance without stipulations.

290 Board discussion

318 Mr. Goldberg discussed subsequent conversations and review of tapes.

335 Mr. Hatch expressed desire to withdraw his "aye" vote of January 26, 1976.

TAPE 97
Side 2

375 Capt. Engler reported that Fire Department had no objection to approval as a one-job variance, but opposed general approval.

380 Mr. Gendler polled Board members and ruled that vote of January 26, 1976 should be revised to be 3-1 in favor of unconditional variance.

Mr. Goldberg stated that Minutes of past meetings would be revised and presented for adoption, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1976 (TAPE 96, SIDE 1)

597 Degenkolb: Mr. Chairman, if you're ready for a motion I would like to move that we approve this material for this project, but not the whole amount. Give tentative approval for other projects, but defer that till later because I would like to get the information on the gases and the breakdown and the concentration of the gases, for a general approval. Defer any action on the general approval of the product until such other information is forthcoming. I should also like to see just as a matter of form the official ASTM tests that were done by others. We've been pretty sticky in the past about having....not captive laboratories. We should have the independent laboratory reports....for this project.

Kastius: This is a one-job request. This is strictly for this one job.

Degenkolb: This is strictly for this one job in accordance with the.....

Kastius: As a variance.

600 Degenkolb: As a variance, but will indicate general approval or intent to approve subject to more information, and the information specifically I would like to ask is the tests from independent labs and information on the temperature breakdown....toxic gases.

Others: Second, second

Gendler: All in favor?....Discussion?....All in favor?....

608 Others: Ayes (But note that vote tally was corrected on 5/3/76 to show 3 ayes, 1 no.)

APRIL 19, 1976 (TAPE 97, SIDE 1)

245 Board made no decision in regard to validity of its decision of January 26, 1976, but consideration thereof was deferred until after the recording tape had been checked in detail.

TAPE 97
Side 2

385 Mr. Larsen noted that Pennwalt would request general approval at a later date.

395 Mr. Gendler deferred consideration of adoption of Minutes of 1-26-76, 4-19-76 and 4-23-76 to next meeting.

ITEM 3. (76-6) 1 HALLIDIE PLAZA. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: BUS DUCT ACCESSIBILITY (SEC. 364.2, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE). INTEGRAND, BY ROBERT PINCUS.

400 Mr. Goldberg described request.

415 Mr. Goldhammer, of Gensler and Associates, discussed definitions of "accessible" and "concealed."

Mr. Cammisa cited the N.E.C. comparable provision.

450 Board discussion

486 Mr. Cammisa moved approval as a variance, this one job only. Seconded. Unanimously approved.

ITEMS 4,5,6,7. (FILES 76-7,8,9,10) YERBA BUENA CENTER/ ENTERTAINMENT CENTER

490 Mr. Goldberg described the four requests.

ITEM 4. (76-7) YERBA BUENA CENTER/ENTERTAINMENT CENTER, 3RD STREET, BETWEEN HOWARD AND FOLSOM STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: DEAD END DEPTH OF VERTICAL AISLE (SEC. 3321.F.4, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED.

517 Capt. Engler noted that under State Code, the only basis for possible Board approval would be for temporary use of the extra seats (relating to Item 4).

530 Mr. DeManty, of Architects Associated, and Mr. Lyman Jee spoke to requests and noted probable inclusion of sprinklering of building due to desire of owner.

550 Board discussion

TAPE 97
Side 2

555 Mr. Hatch questioned whether additional sectional details were available to clarify requests.

ITEM 7. (FILE 76-10) YERBA BUENA CENTER/ENTERTAINMENT CENTER, 3RD STREET, BETWEEN HOWARD AND FOLSOM STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: RISE BETWEEN ROWS OF SEATS (SEC. 3321.E.2, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED.

598 Mr. Goldberg referred to similar previous request, File 72-12, considered by Board for earlier YBC project.

620 Capt. Engler described, with aid of sketch on blackboard, the dimensional aspects of modified rise and run.

ITEM 5 (FILE 76-8) YERBA BUENA CENTER/ENTERTAINMENT CENTER, 3RD STREET, BETWEEN HOWARD AND FOLSOM STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: ROOF LOAD, BY ELECTRIC SCORE-BOARD (SEC. 1806, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED.

640 Mr. Goldberg described request.

673 Mr. DeManty stated that sprinklering would be used to compensate for the 20-ft roof height above the highest seats.

ITEM 6. (FILE 76-9) YERBA BUENA CENTER/ENTERTAINMENT CENTER, 3RD STREET BETWEEN HOWARD AND FOLSOM STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: OCCUPANCY SEPARATION OPENINGS (SEC. 503.C, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED.

690 Mr. Goldberg described request and noted that sprinklering would already be required for various other purposes and could thus not be used as compensation for door oversize.

730 Board discussion of Item 5.

770 Mr. Gensler requested presentation of additional details.

784 Mr. Hatch moved continuance of all 4 items relating to YBC and that applicant submit more details and discuss same with Superintendent and Fire Prevention Bureau before presentation to Board.

Seconded

TAPE 97
Side 2

798 Adopted unanimously

ITEMS 8,9,10,11. (FILES 76-11,12,13,14) EMBARCADERO CENTER BLOCK 232

800 Mr. Goldberg described 4 requests in general.

815 Mr. Steinberg, of John Portman & Associates, described requests.

830 Capt. Engler stated that Fire Department had no objection to open doors provided there is "supervision."

ITEM 9. (FILE 76-12) EMBARCADERO CENTER 232 BLOCK, #3 EMBARCADERO CENTER. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: DOORS - MAGNETIC HOLD-OPENS (SEC. 3309.C.4.A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). JOHN PORTMAN & ASSOCIATES

855 Mr. Degenkolb moved granting of variance.

Seconded

859 Adopted unanimously

ITEM 10. (FILE 76-13) EMBARCADERO CENTER 232 BLOCK, #3 EMBARCADERO CENTER. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: DOORS-OMISSION DROP OF SILLS (SEC. 3309.C.4.A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). JOHN PORTMAN & ASSOCIATES.

860 Mr. Goldberg described request.

872 Mr. Steinberg introduced Mr. Glumac.

876 Mr. Glumac referred to tests made at Henry Grady Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia as basis for pressurization design of vestibules with allowance for leakage below doors.

897 Mr. Steinberg described details of Atlanta test.

930 Mr. Glumac stated that he had verified the presented calculations.

938 Capt. Engler stated that Fire Department had no objection.

956 Mr. Whittaker moved adoption of variance, based on independent verification of calculations by a mechanical engineer.

Seconded

976 Adopted unanimously

TAPE 97
Side 2

ITEM 8. (FILE 76-11) EMBARCADERO CENTER 232 BLOCK, #3 EMBARCADERO CENTER. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: LIFE SAFETY PROGRAM - ELEVATOR STATUS DISPLAY LOCATION (SEC. 1807.1.A.5.(b), SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE). JOHN PORTMAN & ASSOCIATES.

980 Mr. Goldberg described request.

996 Capt. Engler cited requirements of the various codes in regard to elevator status panel, and that Fire Department had no objection due to age of subject building.

1013 Mr. Steinberg noted close proximity of station to elevator display.

1040 Mr. Whittaker moved adoption of variance.

Seconded

1047 Adopted unanimously

ITEM 11. (FILE 76-14) EMBARCADERO CENTER 232 BLOCK, #3 EMBARCADERO CENTER. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: PENETRATIONS OF FLOORS - FIRE STOP AT TELEPHONE RISER CABLES (SEC. 4305.B, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDINC CODE). JOHN PORTMAN & ASSOCIATES.

1050 Mr. Coldberg described request.

1080 Capt. Engler stated that equivalent safety had not been demonstrated.

1095 Mr. Steinberg stated that test report was not available, but he felt that it probably was satisfactory.

1115 Mr. Goldberg described history of telephone company project initiated due to questions by San Francisco Bureau of Building Inspection several years ago. He also raised question of continued maintenance of the protection of openings during modifications and during life of building.

1205 Mr. Steinberg withdrew item, subject to further design and resubmission to Superintendent.

Next meeting of Board set for June 7, 1976.

1225 Meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Alfred Goldberg, Secretary
Board of Examiners

WK:dm

cc: Board of Examiners, Parapet Advisory Committee, City Librarian

SF
P85.35
#1
6-7-76

SF
Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

June 7, 1976

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of May 3, 1976 meeting

OLD BUSINESS

3. (76-7, 8, 9 & 10) Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center. Four variances, continued hearing.

NEW BUSINESS

4. (76-16) 530 Bush Street, Storek and Storek. Variance for increased percentage of non-wire glass (Sec. 3304, Exception 1, San Francisco Building Code). Storek and Storek.

SF
Public Works

F
85.35
#2
-7-76

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

June 7, 1976

DOCUMENTS
JUN 25 1976
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler, Degenkolb, Hatch, Kennedy, Whittaker

Secretary: Mr. Levy, Mr. Goldberg

Fire Department Representative: Lt. McKlem

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Cammisa

TAPE 97
Side 2

253 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 7:05 PM.

Agenda amended to add No. 5 - Conflict of Interest.

Amended Agenda adopted unanimously.

Minutes of meetings of 4/19/76, 4/23/76 and 5/3/76 adopted unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

287 (76-7) YERBA BUENA CENTER/ENTERTAINMENT CENTER, 3RD STREET, BETWEEN HOWARD AND FOLSOM STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: DEAD END DEPTH OF VERTICAL AISLE (SEC. 3321.F.4, S. F. BUILDING CODE). ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED.

(76-10) YERBA BUENA CENTER/ENTERTAINMENT CENTER. 3RD STREET, BETWEEN HOWARD AND FOLSOM STREETS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE RE: RISE BETWEEN ROWS OF SEATS (SEC. 3321.E.2, S. F. BUILDING CODE). ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED.

297 Mr. Goldberg discussed statement made at prior meeting.

(76-7) Little amplification provided by appellant except stadium listing and rationale for dead end based on corridor analogy. Stadia traditionally do not meet code. Dead end corridor argument not valid since code provision involved relates to bleachers, not same as corridor. Do not see anything that changes the Bureau of Building Inspection's previous position. Suggest installation of cross aisle as part of temporary stands.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

TAPE 97
Side 2

(76-10) Height of riser. Board approved variance on original YBC plans, reducing platform from 16+ inches to 11-1/2 inches. Board previously required handrail, appellant showed that handrail is to be provided.

Bureau of Fire Prevention agreed with Bureau of Building Inspection on need for cross aisle.

Mr. DeManty, Architects Associated, questions addition of cross aisle which would be a barrier to vision. Cross aisle at ice presents a problem of loss of desireable seats.

Presented rationale re: Dead end.

Permitted 200 feet to exiting, maximum distance 210 feet--all others less.

Cannot understand problems of dead end; width of aisle rather than length. Flow of traffic to exiting, so no problem of misdirection.

While in seats, can see total exit pattern. No analogy to dead end in office.

Presented rationale re: Rise and run.

Nothing further than previously presented. Self-explanatory.

387 Mr. Goldberg presented rebuttal.

Section 3321, entitled "Reviewing Stands, Grandstands and Bleachers. Section 3321.F.4, cites dead end special requirements which are comparable to the Uniform Building Code and State Fire Marshal. If so, there is a question as to whether the Fire Department would accept the Board's decision since the Board does not have jurisdiction over Fire Department as only agent for Title 19. None of the stadia cited are in California.

Fire Department: Must have cross aisle.

Appellant: Oakland has cross aisle; Los Angeles Forum has cross aisle.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

TAPE 97
Side 2

Mr. Hatch: "What events in Arena?"

Mr. DeManty: "With this configuration, nothing but ice events."

Mr. Hatch: "If these 'temporary' seats become permanent, then the dead end aisle will also become permanent."

Mr. DeManty: When events are not on ice, there will be a through exit to the arena (opening dead end corridor), the rail will be removed."

Mr. Hatch: "The Board approved first arena in 1972 with reservations as a one-job only approval. If either variance is now granted it will set a precedent.

Mr. DeManty: "Board sets precedent each time."

460 Mr. Hatch: "Comparison to dead end in office building is not valid. People use offices daily; the arena is used only a few times and is not a fair comparison. Candlestick rise and run is too steep."

Mr. Whittaker: "Board action is pre-empted by the Fire Department."

Mr. Goldberg: "A separate ruling from Chief Carli will be required, if Fire Department request is not met."

502 Mr. Whittaker: "Would the Fire Marshal accept the Board ruling?"

Fire Department representative: "Fire Department would not accept design without cross aisle. On the prior decision on the rise and run, we will accept it with a handrail."

Mr. Hatch: "Since the 1972 action, due to violence in sports, etc., I would hesitate to approve this. It creates a hazard. I do not feel a handrail can extend far enough to feel secure traversing each tread.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

TAPE 97
Side 2

563 Mr. Gendler: "The problem with getting out of the aisle and unto the step is that the back of the seat encroaches."

572 Mr. Lyman Gee: "How about splay to avoid tripping?"

619 Mr. Hatch expresses concern with the upper arena steps in case of panic.

Mr. Degenkolb states that a handrail would be beneficial.

643 Mr. Degenkolb states that in the problem of steps vs. problem of vision, he would prefer to have better vision and take the slight risk of tripping. He is in favor of accepting variance, not a panic situation.

677 Mr. Whittaker moved that Appeal 76-10 be approved subject to splay of lower step to underseat area in cooperation between the Bureau of Building Inspection and the Fire Department and with the addition of a handrail approved by both the Fire Department and the Bureau of Building Inspection.

Mr. Degenkolb seconded the motion.

Motion passed 4-1 with Mr. Hatch voting nay.

701 Mr. Whittaker moved that Appeal 76-7 be disapproved.

Mr. Degenkolb seconded the motion.

Motion adopted unanimously. Appeal 76-7 disapproved 5-0.

TAPE 98
Side 1

001 Yerba Buena Center/Entertainment Center continued. Roof load by electric scoreboard (76-8) and occupancy separation openings (76-9).

Mr. Goldberg stated that fans weigh 10,000 pounds concentrated load and ductwork 6,000 pounds concentrated load. The equipment is carried on purlins.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5

TAPE 98
Side 1

Scoreboard, single load on tension ring, then on truss. Ductwork, uniform loading. Large roof, small load. Code does not grant unprotected truss for other equipment. Matter of interpretation as to whether work can be considered similar to air conditioning and like loads or whether a variance is needed.

025 Mr. Yee stated that if scoreboard is considered concentrated load, they will distribute load.

Mr. Goldberg stated that according to Sec. 1806 ventilator equipment on unprotected trusses is allowed.

Mr. Degenkolb stated that for this size there does not seem to be a difference from normal roof load. If it poses a fire hazard, then different. No different than normal gymnasium load

049 Appellant: "Code does not indicate location of loads."

Mr. Goldberg stated that the issue is the weight of the scoreboard and the comparability to Code exempted equipment.

061 Mr. Degenkolb moved that electric scoreboard, as discussed by proponent, be considered as normal roof load

Mr. Hatch seconded the motion.

Motion adopted unanimously.

065 Mr. Goldberg discussed the occupancy separation openings (76-9). Oversized door for 3-hour separation. Fire sprinkler system installed for other reasons. Door into garage and storage areas. Certified doors have been accepted before, but this should be considered due to other variances given and:

1. Accept certification (has precedent).

2. Density of sprinklers.

3. Devices other than fusible links.

Appellant stated that door is 16 ft. high, certified

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6

TAPE 98
Side 1

by UL but cannot be labeled due to its being over 120 sq. ft.

Fire Department is not satisfied with fusible link. Use smoke detector. Fire has to get very hot to melt the link.

125 Mr. Degenkolb moved that 200 sq. ft. be allowed with 3-hour certified assembly consisting of two doors with Bureau of Building Inspection and Fire Department approved closing device other than fusible link. This based upon entire building being sprinklered.

Mr. Hatch seconded the motion.

Motion adopted unanimously.

ITEM 4 (76-16). 539 BUSH STREET. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE FOR INCREASED PERCENTAGE OF NON-WIRE GLASS (SEC. 3304, EXCEPTION 1, S. F. BUILDING CODE). STOREK AND STOREK.

153 Mr. Goldberg outlined the Bureau's position:

The requested variance exceeds permitted glass in corridor wall by using total corridor dimension and aggregating one side. Building is fully sprinklered. When Board considered other matters in minutes of August 5, 1974, page 5 (Tape 1030) and at 1140 - variance based in part on supervised sprinklers complete.

The question is whether at ground level the sprinklers stipulated in 1974 can be used for extended glass percentage.

Appellant stated sprinkler density would be doubled adjacent to glass.

Mr. Goldberg stated that if sprinkler is only for glass area we would have allowed it.

170 Fire Department concurs with Bureau of Building Inspection position.

Appellant, Richard Storek, plans for first floor

CONTINUED ON PAGE 7

TAPE 98
Side 1

tenant's permit were filed after other tenant plans. Building is already constructed. Variance is requested as a hardship. An additional five sprinkler heads would be put in adjacent to glass area.

Sprinklers for 2nd through 6th floors from prior variance. Cellar and 1st floor due to other situation (unenclosed stairs). Does not feel that additional heads are required.

196 Mr. Goldberg stated that reason for variance is the aggregation of glass, rather than 25% of each room, also, plain glass vs. wire glass in 1-hour wall.

Question of use of sprinkler for another variance on another floor of building. Had this not been a Board of Examiners matter, the Bureau of Building Inspection would probably have approved this proposal.

206 Mr. Storek questioned Bureau's interpretation: 25% of room wall or total wall.

Mr. Hatch stated that sprinklers are required under 1974 variance, this has nothing to do with change in glass now.

Mr. Storek stated that sprinklers were increased to 2nd floor. Rest of building because of 1974 request.

230 Mr. Hatch stated that prior variance was made on basis of total supervised sprinkler system.

Mr. Goldberg stated that issue is further use of said sprinkler system.

Mr. Degenkolb stated that if no variance is required, then no system is required.

240 Mr. Hatch stated that increase of glass area calls for use of the system for plain glass.

Mr. Goldberg stated that if no previous variance, then the Bureau would have allowed it.

Fire Department is satisfied.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 8

TAPE 98
Side 1

257 Mr. Degenkolb moved for approval of the configuration of the plain glass in the lst floor corridor with additional sprinkler heads and on the basis of hardship.

Mr. Hatch seconded the motion.

270 Motion adopted unanimously.

280 Conflict of interest.

Mr. Levy described effect on Board of Examiners of new State requirements.

Next possible meeting scheduled for July 26, 1976.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

RCL:cg

cc: City Librarian
Board of Examiners

SF
Pk5.35
#2
7/26/76

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

July 26, 1976

DOCUMENTS
AUG 5 1976
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs, Hatch, Camissa, Gendler (Chairman), Lera, Whitaker & Degenkolb

Secretary: R.C. Levy, Supt BBI
Fire Dept: Capt. T. Engler
BBI: W. Maitland, Chief Elect. Insp.
E. Hiltman, Sr. Elect. Insp.

Note: Due to problems with tape recorder, meeting notes were taken in long hand by M. Choy, Sr. Civil Eng'r and not tape recorded.

Gendler: Meeting called to order at 7:05 pm; Agenda adopted unanimously with the insertion at the request of Mr. Hatch, Item 6: Procedure for Code Change for Restriction of Public Assembly below Grade, under New Business; Minutes of 6/7/76 Meeting adopted unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 3 (76-18) GTE SYLVANIA: VARIANCE REQUEST ON ART. 1, DIV. G, S.F. ELECTRICAL CODE

Levy: Problem is regarding switchboard assembly for SCIF Bldg at 9th & Market with circuit breaker devices that are not labeled by UL; hence does not meet min. safety standards of S.F. Electrical Code.

Hiltman: Circuit breakers to be used are not confined to SCIF Bldg. UL has procedure for testing; other components have UL listing.

Engler: Fire Dept. recognizes need for UL testing of circuit breakers.

Haran (GTE): As of to date, CB devices in board are not listed by UL.

Levy: CB devices should be tested; does UL have test procedure?

Haran: There is test procedure by UL now for CBs.

Gendler: Has board been already installed?

Haran: Board is already installed. Hardship if subsequent testing discloses that modifications are required.

Levy: If UL requires modification, then they must have good reason from standpoint of safety. Board should then be changed.

Hiltman: UL have procedures & capability for testing. Board was manufactured prior to set-up of UL test procedures.

Haran: Described switch-board equip't; at time of manufacturing, they were not aware of full UL test procedures; UL had procedures for 1 frame only, therefore full-test criteria were not available at the time of manufacture.

Levy: Referred to Sec. 76, SFEC-Provisional approval may be granted provided device is submitted for specialized testing.

Haran: No min. safety standard has been established since standard doesn't exist until it is published. Unreasonable & very expensive to comply. UL Safety standard promulgated between June and Dec.; board was shipped out in late January. Modifications will cause more problems; UL is in a state of flux.

Hiltman: No-one from dept. has seen board; understand most components are recognized and have been tested under other configurations.

Degenkolb: Noted that the professional-of-record was not present.

Levy: Concern about whether or not safe if not tested.

Camissa: Noted that may boards have been used in SF without UL testing.

Haran: Not aware that design engineer should be available. Stated his title as Quality Control Manager. Stated that even if they were to do it now, they will not be able to label the board as a whole-only part. However he stated that only air CBs are not UL listed; board as a whole conforms with UL, ANSI & NEMA standards and is absolutely safe.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Design Engineer's absense noted.
Effect of delay on the job; hardship on applicant.
Feasibility of field testing.
General good performance record on switchboard equipment noted.

Hatch: Move for continuance: Design Engineer is to appear before Board to discuss testing procedure and other matters as deemed appropriate by the Board.

Motion seconded and approved unanimously.

Dengenkolb: Additional motion-to allow hook-up on a provisional basis if equipment otherwise proven satisfactory with acceptable presentation to the Board. This motion was not seconded.

Gendler: Next meeting set for 8/16/76 as courtesy to GTE at request of Mr. Levy.

ITEM 4 (76-19) PROTECTION ENGINEERING CO. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL AS ELECTRICAL TESTING LAB

Levy: Presented Bureau position with following items of concern:
1. Specific testing approval desired-define limitations.
2. Additional information on Mr. Hershfield's qualifications.
3. Qualifications of four key personnel under Hershfield.
4. Will Mr. Hershfield supervise all testing & control?
5. 2nd in Command apparently a Civil Engineer-should be one with competence in electrical field.
6. What is frequency of inspection services and how does it compare with UL?

Engler: Does lab meet Electrical Code Sec. 75.1 thru Sec. 75.4? Does it meet requirements as reinspection agency under Title 19? Engineer in charge should have sufficient background & experience in electrical testing experience and should have 5 years experience minimum.

Hershfield: Have been approved by State Fire Marshal under Title 19; Testing is primarily in the electrical field and done in own lab or in manufacturer's place only if they have facilities; experienced in preparation of test procedures for major jobs; Organization includes mechanical engineer, electrical engineer and architect; Testing is not on high volume production units but in problem area testing which involves custom design; Qualifications: BS in EE, Masters Degree in Metallurgy and Phd in Solid State Physics;
Frequency of inspections is identical to UL if standard has been established; 2nd in Command is Mr. Bellows, Architect or Mr. Doyle;will provide testing service to determine whether or not a non UL approved module is OK; For any electrical or electronic equipment, can prepare test and demonstration program testing procedure.

Camissa: Is testing done in own lab?

Hershfield: Yes-except for production pieces; then testing can be done for manufacturer by other testing lab under his supervision.

Engler: Inquired about evidence of certification by State Fire Marshal.

Hershfield: Will give that evidence to the Board. Mr. J. Sacco Deputy, Engineering, State Fire Marshal will review their test programs in order to certify compliance with or without modifications.

Camissa: Asked for description of test equipment.

Hershfield: $40,000 to $50,000 worth of test equipment which are essentially electronic testing equipment.

Degenkolb: Asked whether involved with testing of concrete, steel, and structural materials.

Hershfield: Not involved with concrete & steel;
Have experience in burn test in plastics; they can utilized other test facilities and have access to various labs.

Gendler: Asked for comparison of Protection Engineering with Viking Testing Lab.

Hershfield: Can do the same work as Viking; he has been Life Safety Consultant for S.O.M. and also worked with Chief Condon in YBC's Life Safety Program. Had own consulting firm called Lowry and Sorensen in Arizona.

Camissa: Protection Engineering is apparently not set up for switchboard testing.
Is testing equipment to be rented by Protection Engineering?

Hershfield: Yes-they can set up test and demonstration procedure and provide certification whether or not safe.

Gendler: Are people on staff part-time?

Hershfield: Yes, staff people are consultants on a part-time basis.

Levy: Mr. Hershfield is not an electrical engineer; 4th in line is electrical engineer and only part-time;
Lab should be under direct supervision of electrical engineer with experience in testing of electrical equipment;
Min. safety standards should be promulgated by U.L. and not by Protection Engineering.

Hershfield: There is misunderstanding. Not his intent to write industry standards; he is involve with only items not defined by U.L.

Levy: Needs code change to accept more than one Standard writer for the City.

Hershfield: Currently involve with custom-built electrical equipment in 3 places;
Equipment needs certification since they are not U.L. approved;
Propose to City that he can provide test and demonstration procedures in the field in order to certify safety.

Levy: Concerned about approving another labeling service in the City besides UL, FM and ETL;
Need for proper licensing and experience of man-in-charge.

Degenkolb: Operations as outlined are essentially for a consulting service.

Levy: Writing of spec's with min. safety standards per Sec. 74 should be only promulgated by U.L.

Gendler: Do not believe that Hershfield's intent is to compete with U.L.

Hiltman: Generally UL have standards for components:
Request for package approval have not been submitted to UL;
A submittal takes about 2½ years for approval and there is need to have package approved sooner.

Levy: Should be done under supervision of Electrical Engineer
Suggested rewording of application.

Degenkolb: Acceptable for testing of unique assemblages--for one of a kind electrical equipment.

Hershfield: Discussed necessity of labeling--must label with Protection Engineering certification with a non-destruct label.

Gendler: Cited ETL as comparison--ETL was approved for testing of 4 special products only and not as Testing & Reinspection Service.

Hershfield: Desire approval for testing of specialized electrical system such as Life Safety. Responsible professionals are as follows:

Mr. Dowling--Mechanical Systems
Mr. Doyle --Electrical Systems
Mr. Hershfield--Fire Protection Systems
Mr. Bellows--Architectural & Construction Systems

Degenkolb: Mr. Hershfield should put in writing the division of responsibility.

Hershfield: Testing and certification by testing engineer should be under the supervision of a professional engineer. State reg'ts will have to be satisfied.

Gendler: Really an engineering testing service--under State law. Board may not need to rule on this.

Camissa: Applicant should rephrase request.

Levy: Acceptable as long as there is no labeling. May stamp as field job at the job site;not stamped on the production line.
Suggest to table request.

Degenkolb: Move to table request pending agreement on conditions of approval between Mr. Hershfield and Mr. Levy. If agreement is not reached, the matter must go back to the Board. Seconded and passed unanimously.

ITEM 5 (76-17) WARNOCK HERSEY INTERNATIONAL, INC. FIRE TEST FACILITIES AT ANTIOCH. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL AS TESTING AGENCY FOR FULL-SCALE FIRE TESTS

Levy: Matter was reconciled in 1972 for testing of wall assemblies with the proviso that Prof. Troxell were to be in charge. No direct comparisons were made to other furnaces; Prof. Troxell stated in writing that in general facilities conform and are reasonably compatible; professional signature req'd because the facilities were under proprietary control of Kaiser Gypsum. Concerned with the following:

1. Qualification of Mr. Meyer as Fire Protection Engineer--believe registered Civil Engineer is appropriate.
2. Suitability of furnace for testing of doors and windows.
3. Labeling service; frequency of plant inspection; type of service as compared with UL; list of Fire Rating Service; status of booklet and labeling service.

Engler: Has facilities been inspected by State Fire Marshal? Understand that Canadian plant has been approved by SFM. Size of furnace was asked.

Meyer: Some size as UC Furnace.
Gave brief history of Warnock Hersey's development in Canada with acceptance in United States by ICBO and SFM. Kaiser Gypsum has recently leased Antioch Facilities to them. Could ask for approval as testing lab and not as labeling service at this time. Worked with Prof. Troxell at Antioch Test Facilities on all the tests which the professor conducted at Antioch.

Troxell: Worked with Mr. Meyer for last 12 years. He is well qualified--Mr. Meyer has conducted all his test procedures under his supervision. Not prepare to comment on labeling

service, since UC never did this.
Meyer is member of ASTM Committee E5 "Fire Tests of Materials and Construction."

Levy: Concern with labeling and follow-up service---there is not enough information for labeling service. Following are points of concern:

1. Relative status of Fire Protection license vs. C.E. license.
2. No data submitted on comparison with other labs.
3. Has been approved for wall testing only---need more evidence on applicability to doors and windows.
4. Need comparison with other furnaces---not convince that duplication of size, material and configuration would give the same test conditons---need comparative testing.

Troxell: Temperature control is the same---furnace is the same size and configuration; no reason to doubt performance.

Levy: Cited Tunnel testing as example of similar test equipment giving test results between tunnels constructed to same plan and specification that do not give comparable results without adjustment after comparative testing.

Meyer: Professor Troxell has tested 45 doors at UC Furnace.

Levy: Test data for comparison are welcome.

Meyer: Comparative testing is a very expensive proposition.

Troxell: Stated that he is still active but will retire soon. Mr. Meyer has conducted tests under his direction and is fully capable and qualified. Antioch Furnace is comparable in all respects to the UC Furnace.

Gendler: If SFM has approved Antioch Facilities there should be no problem.

Levy: Questions Board of Examiner's decision based upon State Fire Marshal acceptance.

Gendler: Professor Troxell should certify competency of Meyer and equivalence of facilities in writing. Also the Board needs evidence of SFM's acceptance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Fire Protection Engineer Status
Responsibility under Title Act vs. Practice Act.

Degenkolb: Since person could practice, he also must be qualified.

Troxell: Mr. Favro, SFM, is acquainted with Mr. Meyer and could attest to his qualifications.

Engler: Professor Troxell should submit letter attesting to Meyer's qualification.

Degenkolb: Move that Antioch Lab be recognized as Independent Testing Lab for Wall, Door and Window Assemblies, with the proviso that Professor Troxell attest in writing, competency of Mr. George E. Meyer and that the Antioch Furnace is comparable to UC Furnace in all respects. Test reports must be signed by a registered Fire Protection Engineer.

Seconded and passed unanimously.

ITEM 6: PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE FOR RESTRICTION OF PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE

Gendler: Move to place Item 6 on Agenda for next meeting.

Seconded and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned 10:35 p.m.

Next meeting: August 16, 1976

SF Public Library
2/4/76
F
35.35
42

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

December 14, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Hatch, Whittaker, Gendler (Chairman), Cammisa and Degenkolb.

Secretary: Mr. Levy

Fire Dept. Representative: Capt. Engler

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Kennedy

TAPE 99
Side 1

000 Meeting called to order at 7:07 P.M. by Mr. Gendler.

Mr. Hatch requests that Agenda be amended to add item from September 20, 1976 meeting (76-20) on procedure for code change for restriction of public assembly below grade, only as a general discussion, because the Board of Examiners has asked for a report prior to January 1, 1977 for its consideration.

008 Mr. Gendler: Item will be No. 4.

Amended Agenda adopted unanimously.

Minutes of meeting of September 20, 1976 adopted unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

(76-24) JOHN PORTMAN & ASSOCIATES. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE ON SECTION 4706.A, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE; USE OF GYPSUM SHEATHING FOR EXTERIOR CEILING AND ROOF SOFFITS.

Levy: Request is for variance to use Georgia-Pacific gypsum soffit board, with a sealing agent, in lieu of exterior plastering in locations requiring same. Two code sections involved: Sec. 4706.A (delineates where exterior plastering must be used); and Sec. 4710.A (gypsum board shall not be installed on exterior surfaces). Requirements are for durability, not life safety. Feels applicant has not proved that what is provided is equal in all respects to exterior plaster.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

TAPE 99
Side 1

Engler: This is a Building Department matter, but feels strongly that code must be upheld. Will not affect Fire Department operations.

035 Mr. Dendy, of Portman & Associates, starts presentation. Hands out packets of five photographs showing completed installation.

Dendy: This installation was used in an attempt to upgrade the performance of ceiling and soffit materials. Previous installations with plaster have experienced cracking problems. Another factor was the ease of making future alterations. There was no attempt by the architect to ignore these code requirements, in fact, was not aware of them.

050 Architect's experience with this material has been good. Cites Decorative Arts Center in Atlanta, built in 1961, using a similar product by U.S. Gypsum and a protective coating not as good as the Hasa-Cote system provided here.

Georgia-Pacific requires only that the soffit board be painted. On this job Hasa-Cote sealer and a final Hasa-Cote finish coat were applied.

The mechanical installation of the soffit boards conforms to all code requirements.

064 Feels this installation will provide a safe, watertight soffit for the life of the building.

073 At street level, both a drip and 3/4" channel are installed. At more protected locations, the channel is installed. Water moving across these barriers and on to the soffit is unlikely.

090 This type of gypsum board is covered with a special waterproof paper. Georgia-Pacific colors it blue, and U.S. Gypsum colors it green, to readily identify them on the jobsite.

093 Gendler: Does manufacturer require coating the material?

Dendy: Yes. Must be primed and coated with an exterior grade paint.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

TAPE 99
Side 1

Gendler: How does Hasa-Cote compare with Georgia-Pacific requirements?

Dendy: It is better. Hasa-Cote meets a federal specification for inhibiting growth of fungus and mold on the board.

Pittsburgh Testing Laboratories report indicates it has superior resistance to chipping, cracking, impact resistance.

100 Levy: Who has tested this, and under what standards, for durability when exposed to water? For fire resistance, there are standard ASTM tests that can be run. What standards were used to determine suitability of this material for use in exposed locations? What kind of quality control is used in manufacture? In field installation?

106 Dendy: Georgia-Pacific says product conforms to ASTM C-36. Standard requires certain number of soak and dry cycles, then measures sagging under load.

110 Levy: What quality control was used to insure that the boards furnished for the job are the same quality as the boards tested? Also, who tested them?

Dendy: We did not. Presumably, Georgia-Pacific did.

Hatch: Pittsburgh report said tests were conducted in accordance with Federal Specifications TTC-555B. Do the results mean anything as far as compliance with the Building Code?

Levy: Don't know. Don't have specs. However, we are concerned with the assembly as installed, including the coating.

Dendy: A similar Georgia-Pacific installation in Los Angeles was questioned and reviewed by their board. It was approved.

120 Cammisa: What is intent of code?

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

TAPE 99
Side 1

Levy: Durability. Assurance against sags, delaminations, etc.

Locations where exterior plastering is required probably based on likelihood of rain impingement. Has been in the code for a long time.

Degenkolb: Requirement probably got into code when there was only interior type gypsum board available.

126 Levy: We know exterior plastering performs adequately. What do we have here that shows this system is obviously equal or better?

135 Dendy: Levy's concern is valid.

150 Levy: We don't know what the product is. Applicant is citing someone else's product for performance confirmation. That installation has been in place for only 15 years. We expect this building to last many times that length of time. We don't know it meets ASTM standards. We have not seen the tests on it. We don't know the product installed is the same as that tested. We don't know what the referenced Federal specification is for.

160 Whittaker: Code prohibition probably applies to exterior vertical surfaces, and came in prior to existence of this type of material. Also, doubt that the architect, who has a financial as well as artistic involvement with this project, would knowingly put in an inferior material.

165 Snellgrove: Offers to make any tests BBI wishes.

175 Hatch: What tests would BBI like to be made?

180 Levy: Installed assembly should perform as well as plaster under soak and dry cycles.

Dendy: Tests should be worked out with BBI.

Gendler: Perhaps more information is available from Pittsburgh Testing, or the drywall industry.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5

TAPE 99
Side 1

186 Hatch: Moved that applicant and BBI set up agreeable tests to prove equivalence and report back at a future date.

Gendler calls for a second. None given.

195 Degenkolb: Thinks one time approval OK. More desirable than general approval since then manufacturer may try to use it in questionable applications, such as on exterior walls of houses.

Levy: One time approvals are essentially general approvals. Hard to turn down another applicant the following month with a similar request.

220 Gendler: Seconds motion.

230 Gendler calls for votes.

Ayes: Hatch, Gendler, Degenkolb.

Nays: Whittaker, Cammisa.

Levy: Suggested to applicants that they call later on in the week for appointment to discuss tests.

(76-20) PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE FOR RESTRICTION OF PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE. (Continuance from September 20, 1976 meeting.)

265 Levy: Working with Fire Department on the draft for Board to consider. Don't know if it will be ready by January 1, 1977 as planned, but will definitely have it before the next Board meeting.

300 Next meeting set for Monday, January 24, 1977.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

FL:cg
cc: Board of Examiners
Chief Carli, SFFD
City Librarian

BOARD OF EXAMINERS MEETING

December 14, 1976

ATTENDANCE SHEET

(76-24) JOHN PORTMAN & ASSOCIATES

NAME	AFFILIATION
Simon Snellgrove	John Portman & Associates
John Dendy	John Portman & Associates

SF
P&S.35
#2
12/1/77

SF PUBLIC LIBRARY

City Librarian's Copy

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
January 24, 1977

Minutes

ATTENDANCE SHEET

DOCUMENTS

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

(77-1) Norman S. Wright & Co: (California First Bank)

NAME	AFFILIATION
Jack Kniveton	Norman S. Wright & Co.
Carl Jordan	Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Don Puffine	AEK Co.
David Chen	Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Dick Glumac	Glumac & Webster

(77-2) Bentley Engineers Inc: (Bank of America Data Center)

Edward Walker	Bentley Engineers Inc.
Steven Barros	Emerson Electric
Richard Barberger	Business Representative Local 6, IBEW
Howard Muckaby	Bank of America
Lou S. Pollock	The Trane Co.
Roy Gifford	Vann Engineering Co.
Bernie Beckius	Scott Co. of California
Walton H. Hirschfield	Protection Engineering.

GUESTS

Brad Hallihan	Bay Area Climate Control
Jim Hollvarth	L & H Airco
Dave Troup	W. A. Digiacomo Assoc.
Abraham Bachar	Skidmore Owings & Merrill
Calvin Lains	Skidmore Owings & Merrill
M. Shastany	Westates Pac.
F. Wegener	L & H Airco
J. F. Jones	J. A. Nelson Co.
L. W. Bedard	Dinwiddie Construction Co.
Jim Lloyd	Dinwiddie Construction Co.
Jim Lynn	Scott Co. of California
Paul Mayashi	Scott Co. of California
R. J. Krauthamer	ILC Industries
J. M. Rasch	Honeywell Inc.
E. R. Long	Honeywell Inc.
J. L. Breese	J. L. Breese - Mfrs' Agent
Kevin Bowling	Bentley Engineers
John Conzett	Reliance Electric
Sam Yamauchi	JVA Consulting Engineers
Darrel Lackey	JVA Consulting Engineers
Gene Valerio	Air Filter/Control
Robert Voelz	Bentley Engineers
Bart Renefort	Glumac & Webster
C. J. Huffman	Carrier Corp.

GUEST LIST (77-2) BENTLEY ENGINEERS INC: (Bank of America Data Center)

Paul Surmenct	Scott Co. of California
L. O Freeman	Hess, Greiner, Pollard
Ed Merino	Hess, Greiner & Pollard
Tom Gilbertson	L & H Air-Co/Dow Chemical
Frank Coudeh	Bentley Engineers
Dick Byers	M. S. Wright & Co.
Mike Grimes	M. S. Wright & Co.
Dich Leao	M. S. Wright & Co.
John F. Werner	Trane Co.
Ed Arizubi	AMK Corp.
Dick Porter	G. J. Yamas Co. Inc.
Gordon Walker	G. J. Yamas Co. Inc.
Charles McLaughlin	McLaughlin Associates
Ken Lloyd	Lillard Co.
Jan Black	P.A. TV
Marian V. Hewsfield	Protection Engineering
Stan Heywood	Lighting System
Gerry Yaffe	Tempco Equipment Co., Inc.

January 24, 1977

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Hatch, Whittaker, Gendler (Chairman), Canisso, Kennedy, Lera and Dennholm
Secretary: Mr. Levy, Dept. 301
Fire Dept: Capt. T. Engler

TAPE 99
Side 1

(320) Meeting called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Mr. Gendler. Mr. Gendler reversed the order of the agenda so that Item 77-2 could be taken first.

Item 1. Amended Agenda adopted unanimously

Item 2. Minutes of Dec. 14, 1976 meeting adopted unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 4 (77-2) PENTLEY ENGINEERS INC., U. A. PIOLANTI ASSOCIATES INC., A JOINT VENTURE: PRODUCT APPROVAL REQUEST PER ARTICLE 3, DIVISION F, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE; USE OF FLEXIBLE, METAL-CLAD, PLUG-IN WIRING SYSTEM OF BRANCH CIRCUIT WIRING, 277/480 VOLT FLUORESCENT LIGHTING FIXTURES AS MANUFACTURED BY EMERSON ELECTRIC CO. (BANK OF AMERICA DATA CENTER)

(350) Mr. Levy passed out additional information to the Board on Protection Engineering Co.'s approval conditions and copies of IBEW Local 6 letter to Board of Examiners dated 1/24/77 and hand-delivered the same day.

(365) Mr. Gendler excused Mr. Lera from the Board's deliberations on this item because of possible conflict of interest.

(370) Hiltman: There is no provision in the Code to allow use of flexible, metal-clad, plug-in wiring systems. Discussed obvious advantages of the system but will need change in Code before City can accept. Have had problems in the past with similar systems. Possibility of inducing hazards in the future. Metal cladding is similar to BX; if bent too sharply may break sharply - shorts and other hazards can result; Vibrations can also loosen and cut off power. Concern with taps taken off distribution boxes and the cutting or splicing of cable links with the danger of damaging or nicking installation.

(400) Levy: Agrees with hazards cited by Miltman. This is convenient from of installation if done properly, but if done by untrained people, may create hazardous conditions. Concern that for smaller job permits may not be taken out with the absence of any inspection at all compounding the problem.

(410) Engler: Stated possibility of flex-piping being hung or tied to sprinkler piping. No interference with sprinkler system must be assured.

(415) Levy: Summarized Bureau position to advise Mr. Edward Walker, Vice President of Bentley Engineers who missed the first part of the proceedings.

(420) Walker: Stated that the Bank needs the flex-system to add or subtract fixtures as needed in an expeditious manner since the Data Center is on continuous operation. Modifications will not be done indiscriminately. They will have Union representatives on hand during installation. Stated need to move and install fixtures quickly.

(435) Barros: Introduced himself as Steven Barros, Manager, Emerson Electric Co. Discussed the UL testing of the cable assembly and showed example of an assembly. Plug-in cables are manufactured to specific lengths and has been UL tested to determine suitability. The cables conform to min. bend radius - however other wiring methods can also be damaged by sharp bending. The cable units are not intended to be field modified - if modified, they would no longer be UL approved. The cables are factory-tested during assembly under full-rated current.

The size of the conductor is No. 12 and it is a fully grounded system - cannot be taken apart in the field; also not intended to be tampered with.

(470) Barros: At this point Mr. Barros set up equipment case on the table and demonstrated the use of the plug-in cables with a board mounted distribution box, pre-wire switch tap-box and switch box assemblies. The ease of plugging in and removal was demonstrated. Stated that after the system is plugged in, it is completely metal encased. The system will be used for lighting distribution.

(510) Bamberger: Introduced himself as Richard Bamberger, Business Representative, IBEW, Local 6: Referred to Union letter of 1/24/77 with 7 questions to be answered by the proponent. Noted that the cables are said to be UL approved - but for what approval? Also is concern with the spring tension attachments and effect of current pass-through.

(530) Levy: Questioned Mr. Walker what he meant by "Union representatives" and Mr. Walker responded that he meant licensed electrical contractor. Stated his concern that a one-job approval actually is a tacit agreement to a general approval with the danger of similar future jobs getting the same approval and providing little or no control. Appears that system can be easily modified and the question of control of modification is unanswered.

(550) Millman: The cable units are in the same category as BX. Discussed the probability of spring tension attachments becoming weakened with age; oxidation or corrosive atmosphere creating high resistance, heat and eventual break-down. Also stated concern of the size of enclosures creating possible over-fill on conductors with not enough air space.

(570) Engler: Reiterated Fire Department concern of the possibility of tying into sprinkler system which may be part of the Life Safety System.

Mr. Walker responded that that is an inspection control problem.

(580) Cannisa: The questions brought up by Local 6 are still unanswered.

(590) Walker: Responded to the 7 Union questions as follows:

1. This type of system has not been totally approved by the California Division of Industrial Safety

Ans: The California Division of Industrial Safety does not get involved with commercial installations.

2. Would the distribution boxes and tap boxes meet the requirements for being accessible if in a concealed ceiling?

Ans: If ceiling is accessible - yes and in the same manner. Almost all fixtures are highly accessible and are to be approved for use in mainly accessible places. If fixed, fixtures will be accessible. In answer to Mr. Levy's question, the local switching is to be located in the walls.

3. Would the circuits and switching be identified?

Ans: Units have decals and labels - traceability of the system is assured.

4. What prevents a circuit from being overloaded and thereby becoming a fire hazard? Because with this type of system, you just keep adding loads.

Ans: Circuit breakers in panel boards prevent overloads.

5. The panel cover appears to be a NM type and there have been serious grounding problems with this type of covering, and if the wires are modified in the field, it would become a NM system.

Ans: Basic construction of the cable is similar to NM, However, there are special guidelines for special test-runs that has little similarity to NM. The cable is only similar in the wrap-around armor. Mr. Barros then showed the differences in the cut-away construction of the cables.

6. This type of system allows unqualified workers to be installing electrical systems which would jeopardize the public safety.

Ans: Installation work is intended to be done by licensed electrical contractors.

7. It is doubtful that the unqualified installer of this type of system would call for inspection which would also increase the lack of public safety.

Ans: Installation by licensed electrical contractors - no unqualified workers.

(660) Barros: Any changes or modifications in the system units must go back to UL for new certification. Discussed spring tension clips - tested by UL for integrity of contact for 30 amps, where designed for 20 amps. Stated that he is not prepared to answer on oxidation and corrosion problems; these factors are assumed to have been taken into account by the designers.

(680) Barros: The overfill problem is presumably taken care of in testing by UL. Mr. Barros answered Mr. Canissa's question on whether there are approved methods for splicing in the affirmative. Two cable assemblies can be spliced in specific ways.

(695) Comisso: The system appears to be a safe construction. It seems that the applicant has taken necessary precautions and does not suspect danger in its approved use.

(700) Marsh: This is a request for a one-job approval but such approvals turn out to be essentially general approvals since subsequent applicants for the same thing are hard to turn down once the precedent has been set.

(725) Walker: The one-job request was influenced by the owner, Bank of America.

(744) Buckaby: Introduced himself as Homer Buckaby, Vice President, Bank of America. The bank needs the flexibility since it must remain in operation 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. The Bank is continually remodeling; and speed and minimum of service interruption is essential. The Bank has no electrician on its staff--all work will be done by licensed electrical contractors. Their intent is to retain Bentley Engineers to design all modifications.

(768) Amberger: Questioned compliance to all applicable codes. The screwed connections on boxes can easily be modified and damaged. Code does not intend that circuits be overloaded until the breaking point. State Industrial Safety people is concern with safety of personnel not with equipment. Does not believe that the system has approval by CALOSHA.

(793) Dahberger: UL approves many things. The factor of safety is of concern where the public is involved. The spring connection is under continuous load and with oxidation and vibration over the years would be the first contact to breakdown.

(800) Whittaker: Made a motion that the application be approved. Motion was seconded.

BOARD DISCUSSION

(810) Gendler: This is a 24 hour manned computer center.

Degenkolb: Recommended 2 conditions to the approval:

1. Installation and modifications shall be done by licensed electrical contractor.

2. Modifications shall be designed by a licensed electrical engineer.

(810) Levy: The requested approval does not comply to local ordinances.

(850) Kennedy: Condition proposed by Greenhalgh is not enforceable since there can be no real control. A one-job approval is essentially a general approval.

Hiltman: The present method already provides flexibility. Emphasizes that the emergency lighting tester as well as the Life Safety System may be jeopardized.

(870) Gendler: Repeated motion made by Whittaker and seconded by Kennedy:

Motion to approve the use of Sterilite, small-size, plug-in wiring as manufactured by Pearson Electric Co. for a one-job basis for the Bank of America Data Center subject to the following conditions:

1. Installation and modifications for any changes shall be by a licensed electrical contractor.

2. Modifications for any changes shall be designed by a licensed electrical engineer.

(890) Gendler: Calls for votes.

Ayes: Whittaker, Gendler, Canosa, Rosenholz
Nays: Hatch, Kennedy
Abstained: None

Motion was passed 4 to 2.

(900) Hatch: His objection was voiced because of the aspect of the one-job approval.

Item 3 (77-4) NORMAN S. WRIGHT & CO.: VARIANCE REQUEST TO ARTICLE 1, DIVISION G, SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE; USE OF VANE-AXIAL FANS WITH DIRECT DRIVEN ELECTRICAL MOTORS AS PART OF THE HVAC SYSTEM. (CALIFORNIA FIRST BANK)

Side 2
000 Hiltman: Discussed hazards of fan blades running with outer edges at supersonic speeds; strobe tested and alloys have fractured under test. Competitive product has been approved subsequent to testing by Protection Engineering.

At this point Mr. Hiltman gave a copy of the test report by Protection Engineering to the Board.

(000) Wilson: Mr. Wilson stated that Underwriters Laboratories or a similar approved independent testing lab should be required to determine suitability.

(030) Levy: Discussed inconsistency of Sections 70 and 71 of the Electrical Code. Mr. Wilson's position is in accord with Section 70 which permits a provisional approval upon testing by an approved testing lab.

(050) Engler: Fans are an integral part of the smoke removal system required as part of the Life Safety Program and must have approval of a recognized testing lab.

(055) Levy: In response to a Board question stated that the request is for a general approval.

(060) Greenhalgh: Questioned whether or not the request should be considered a general approval where no professional is needed with filing fee of $150.00 or a one-job approval where professional is needed with filing fee of $30.00.

Levy: Mr. Levy ruled that the request has been considered as a variance request to Article 1, Division C and the $150.00 filing fee of $30.00 is appropriate in this case for a general approval.

(085) Kniveton: Introduced himself as Jack Kniveton, President of Norman S. Wright & Co. Called on Carl Jorden of Skidmore Owings & Merrill to address Board.

(070) Jorden: Referred to Section 71 of the Electrical Code and stated that the product is already covered since the Superintendent has not declared a potential hazard to the public by means of a public notice. Stated that the fans have been installed and that shock or fire hazard could not be applied to stress on fan vanes. Questioned the criterion that because one has already set a precedent on the testing of an item, all others have to follow suit.

(090) Maintained that fans are safe and he is not aware of any problems that could be solved by the testing lab requirement. All units are factory tested before being shipped. Discussed differences between belt-driven and direct-driven fans. Do not believe there is a firm code requirement to require a testing lab.

(110) Kniveton: These are not new products and have been installed all over San Francisco. Cited use in nuclear power plants, mines and submarines. Asked that if the product is belt-driven, would a UL listing have been required by the City?

(120) Siltzer: UL does not approved belt-driven fans without certain limitations; if certain components are used, no substitutions are permitted. Every component of an approved unit must remain the same as the tested one.

(130) Levy: Mr. Siltzer's question is not pertinent to the request.

(140) Grissom: Discussed aspects of the fan design and components of the direct-drive unit with respect to energy conservation. Cannot recall any accidents in San Francisco.

(170) Griffin: Introduced himself as Don Griffin, AiR Co. It was their unit that was tested in the presentation regarding Energy saving to the Board by Mr. Siltzer. He is in general agreement with Siltzer, however his company did not intend that their testing should lead to a requirement. Fans are not sophisticated like heaters - feel that the testing equipment is not intended for engineered equipment. UL approval for components is on reed guarantee. Since a registered engineer is needed, testing is redundant. UL has no standards for this type of equipment. Performance is in the hands of the licensed engineer - a test assure that two components must work together. Emphasized in closing that their test report should not be used as a precedent.

(220) Hirschfield: Walter Hirschfield of Protection Engineering: Introduced himself and stated that he is a safety engineer, American S.V. requested his services in testing the fan. There were no written standards and the resulting test complies with NEMA and UL 378 on control equipment. They are acting on behalf of the City of San Francisco to assure manufacturing to these standards. Their purpose was to confirm what the manufacturer claimed about their product as a disinterested 3rd party.

(240) Chen: David Chen, Electrical Engineer, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill: The motor and fan are electrically designed and connected and is safe from an electrical point of view. If there is a short in the motor, the fan will stop.

(245) Levy: The testing requirement is not ideal, for if no one goes to UL, then no one else needs to comply since no standards would have been set. The ordinance is not clear, therefore the Bureau needs guidelines for interpretation. Discussed conflicting aspects of Section 76. The problem is to decide what has and what has not to be tested. Therefore a code change or guidelines are required.

(275) Fowler: V. bearing for public safety is considered private. There is a distinction between stocked items (inventory) and engineered products.

(290) Levy: Engineered products are subject to less chance of irresponsibility use. The standards for safety were not primarily consumer oriented and needs updating with time.

(300) Jordan: Discussed quality control and manufacturer's adherence to mechanical standards. These problems are solved by the Electrical Engineer and the licensed electrical contractor.

(314) Representative: Oil Fields Conservation Law. Referred to Code's Administrative Guidelines A-20 in which each person engaged certifies proper installation and functioning of equipment related to Life Safety.

(320) Climer: Dick Climer, Climer & Webster. There are some testing done in accordance with recognized industry standards. (UMC, NFPA). They also comply with O/SHA requirements.

(335) Hilmon: Referred to Section 71 which requires that the device shall be submitted to a testing lab. Section 71 refers to any equipment for which standards have not been set.

(340) Cavissa: Does not appear that Hirschfield actually ran tests on the fan. That he did was to confirm performance and an engineer can do the same thing essentially.

Levy: Hirschfield did run required tests.

(350) Hirschfield: There are 6 industry related standards. As Safety Engineer, his responsibility is to run tests in accordance to applicable standards. Horsepower factor was utilized in addition to bench-testing done. His report has certified safety.

(375) Cavissa: An engineer can do essentially what Hirschfield has outlined.

(380) Levy: Emphasized need to established guidelines.

(385) Univetor: Cited cost of obtaining testing by companies like Hirschfield's. Discussed merits of engineered equipment with regard to inherent safety and that lab testing is redundant.

(410) Gilbert: Reiterated that any system designed for inspection must be electrical product not be compared. There are mechanical or electrical hazards. UL has a program testing to accommodate the needs of cities.

(420) Goodman: That is the performance record of Texas with respect to hazards?

(425) Fiumara: Have installed 31 Tens with 4 years of experience in the Commissioner's Office - no problems. Can confirm that it is a safe device.

(440) Sandler: Engineered system specified is not generally used of the job by the consultant.

(455) Levy: Selective testing should be required of the products line. Select most hazardous and/or most representative and test. Other cities have the same problems. Judgement must also enter into the picture.

(460) Litchfield: The testing was at the request of engineer & architect & generic approval on the book. The only practical approach is a generic point-by-point, determine acceptable testing will be productive in code.

(470) Wolfe: Bob Wolfe, Mechanical Engineer: discussed UL testing and preparation of standards. If City wishes devices tested, that should be stimulated in the Code. It is not fair for one testing lab to certify every piece of electrical equipment. It is costly to get UL to prepare standards. The City should come up with specific guidelines for devices that are not UL approved. There should be set up specific standards to test by.

(490) Levy: The independent testing lab confirms to the design engineer the performance and safety standards required. It performs a function but is not a perfect solution.

(500) Candler: Questioned practicality of the myriad of testing that may be inferred.

(505) Pollock: Lee Pollock, Crane Co.: It is a problem how to do business in City with regard to UL requirements. UL is inflexible since any minor changes from the approved item or system voids the approval. This procedure stifles product improvement.

(5'7) Clifford: Mov Clifford, Vann Corporation Corp. Cited problems of construction control and then find that the product is unfit. In the end, the contractor or owner finally gets mad and moves on but a lot of money. It is not fair to set one person or organization to find the initial fault.

(370) Deelius: Bernie Deelius, Scott Co. of California. The reason for ASC contracting Mayfield for the testing was experience - they wanted the removal to continue. His company has installed 200 - 300 wind-driven type with no failures and only 3 failures of the centrifugal types.

(5'7) Wilson: Were the 700 installations in the City?
Mr. Deelius: No - only 3 in San Francisco.

(375) Mayfield: The owners' manuals relative to overspeed testing. In accordance with the requirements. Fans are of both centrifugal-type roof blowers. The heads are very small.

(375) The manufacture of the fans is under quality control. The electrical hazard is very small with 1/4 h motors (single sealed). The blades are properly installed and balanced dynamically.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Board discussion ensued on holding the general approval in abeyance, pending the agency's pre-job approval and getting on a general committee to consider possible Code revisions and/or providing guidelines for the future. Mr. Love suggested that this committee could be set up with industry participation and guidelines could be given to the board within 60 days. It was decided to proceed with an interim general approval in view of other jobs that are waiting the Board's decision.

(651) Carlson: Moved to grant interim general approval of the Jay Vane-Axial Fans to the applicant until guidelines are established.

Seconded and passed unanimously.

(670) Oppenkolb: Moved that the appropriate committee be set up by the Secretary of the Board to set guidelines for all aspects of testing requirements pursuant to the Electrical Code.

Seconded and passed unanimously.

Board of Examiners Meeting Minutes
January 24, 1977
Page 12

(Cont) Dentler: Because of the late hour, Item 5 (10-2) on public research being made to determine dates for next meeting. Discussion then ensued between Dr. Dentler and Chief Carli's research and discussion followed in which Dr. Lederle also participated. It was decided to defer the matter to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 PM.

Next regular meeting: Monday, April 4, 1977 7:30 PM

Robert E. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

REL/ej

cc: Board of Examiners
Mary Laberdine

SF Public Works
SF 85.35 2 4/77
Minutes

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
April 4, 1977

ATTENDANCE SHEET

(77-20) PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE, PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE

NAME	AFFILIATION
Roger Boas	Chief Administrative Officer
Mario Ciampi	Architect
Dominic D'Amico	NCAIA Codes Committee
John G. Degenkolb	Turner Construction Co. Fire Protection Consultant
Michael Hearn	MBT Associates
John Igoe	YBC Coordinator, CAO's Office
Norman Karasick	City Architect
Robert A. Kenealy	Deputy City Attorney
John D. Quinn, Jr.	Turner Construction Company
James Ream	James Ream and Associates
Robert J. Sullivan	S. F. Convention & Visitors Bureau
F. Tomsick	MBT Associates

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

April 4, 1977

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler (Chairman), Camissa, H.Degenkolb, Hatch, Kennedy

Secretary: Mr. Levy, Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection
Mr. Choy, Bureau of Building Inspection

Fire Department: Chief Charles W. Carli
Capt. Thomas Engler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Whittaker

TAPE 100
Side 1
000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 7:06 PM.

Mr. Levy requested that Items 4 and 5 be postponed. The applicants have been notified and agreed to the postponement in view of the prospective length of the first item on the Agenda.

Item 1. Amended Agenda adopted unanimously.

Item 2. Minutes of meeting of January 24, 1977 adopted unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 3. (76-20) PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE FOR PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE IN EXCESS OF 1,000 PERSONS.

010 Mr. Gendler introduced Mr. Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer, to the Board members and also to the audience at large.

Boas: Hotel people, the Chamber of Commerce and business people believe that tourism would increase provided convention facilities are increased. The manufacturing business and related businesses have been phasing out of San Francisco and we need to promote more service facilities. Tourism is a major business which should be promoted in San Francisco.

CONTINUED ON PAGE TWO

TAPE 100
Side 1

Several attempts have been made in the past to construct Yerba Buena Center Project but have been stopped by lawsuits.

Discussed history of previous YBC Project endeavors.

Discussed merits and shortcomings of Proposition S, passed in the 1976 election.

The City has been mandated to provide convention facilities which will be financed by the hotel tax money. The hotel tax will be increased from 2% to 4% providing 6 to 7 million dollars annually. There will be some 85 million dollars available for spending over a 30 year period, which minus all costs comes to about 65 to 70 million dollars for construction.

Stated that the Exhibition Hall should be an underground structure, if not, a lawsuit may be instituted. Realizes that quite a budget is required for underground construction, but if it is not underground, it may not be built.

Urged Board of Examiners to consider all necessary safeguards to make it safe, but to keep in mind the economics of the problem.

The City has already spent a substantial amount in engineering plans in the last YBC proposal that are practically useless.

055 Levy: Discussed the chronology of the Agenda Item.

August 16, 1976; Board of Examiners passed a motion that Mr. Levy and Chief Carli prepare a joint draft for a proposed Code change that would permit public assembly in excess of 1,000 persons below grade.

065 January 24, 1977; proposal was given to the Board of Examiners for consideration as part of the Agenda. Because of the lateness of the hour, the item was deferred to the following meeting.

The basic philosophy of the proposal of January 18,1977 is to make the building as safe below as it is at grade or above grade on the basis that this would conform to the request of the Board.

TAPE 100
Side 1

065 The Uniform Building Code was researched back to 1964 which shows that public assembly greater than 1,000 below grade is prohibited.

The San Francisco Building Code allows public assembly greater than 1,000 below grade, provided a supervised sprinkler system is installed.

075 Discussed procedure for a Code change. The Board of Examiners can recommend a Code change to the Superintendent of Building Inspection; the Superintendent makes a recommendation to the Director of Public Works. Approval or disapproval is up to the Director of Public Works. The Director then transmits the proposal to the Chief Administrative Officer, after which it goes to the Board of Supervisors for hearings and decision.

Discussed the items of the January 18, 1977 Transmittal to the Board of Examiners. Of major concern is Item 3 dealing with Enclosed Ramps.

Discussed the schedule of requirements below grade and percentages of ramps required accordingly.

Item 4 on sprinkler density is more specific than the present Code.

Item 5 contains several changes that are not covered by the Code, as follows: Management control program; fireproofing of all structural members; life safety system; and other restrictions and requirements.

135 Necessary to increase the safety beyond our present Code requirements; the question is to what degree? And, if to the degree of UBC requirements, that might mean prohibition.

138 Carli: Proposed code change is a joint effort of the S.F. Fire Department and the Bureau of Building Inspection, made at the request of Board of Examiners.

Emphasized that the 1/18/77 draft submitted to the Board is a preliminary draft. Engineering studies are needed in order to focus attention on areas of concern. Yerba Buena Center should not be exclusively considered in the context of the code change proposal.

CONTINUED ON PAGE FOUR

APE 100
Side 1

150

Igoe: (YBC Coordinator) Stated that the Yerba Buena Center retained Mr. John Degenkolb as consultant for the project. This appointment was from a list of experts as recommended by Mr. Levy.

160

H.Degenkolb: Wanted it to be on record that there should be no conflict of interest involved in his serving as Board member even though he is related to John Degenkolb.

Levy: Stated that he has discussed this with the Deputy City Attorney and has been advised that there is no conflict of interest. Mr. Kenealy concurred.

165

J.Degenkolb: Introduced himself as fire protection engineer and code consultant. Believes it is premature for code change at this time and is better to handle it as a variance instead.

Section 16 of the Uniform Building Code permits alternate methods for providing equivalent safety. UBC does not require items such as smoke detectors, life safety system, management control, in-house fire brigade, etc.

180

J. Degenkolb: Storage should be provided for packing materials.

195 Discussed the points of his letter of March 7, 1977, in particular the comparison of ramps vs. stairways. A greater length of travel would be required for using ramps; a 30' depth would need 335' of travel distance.

215 As ramps are enclosed, during fire conditions ramps doors will probably be held open, thus creating undue exposure to smoke for the people in the ramp corridor since it takes several minutes to traverse the ramp corridor to the outside. Therefore, believes

CONTINUED ON PAGE FIVE

215 that stairs are better than ramps for this purpose. However, in order to provide adequate safeguard for handicapped people, a minimum of two ramps, as remote from each other, as is practical, should be provided.

The Management Control Program should be City controlled and maintained, in order to be effective.

Agrees with fire protection of all structural members.

Discussed various aspects of the life safety system and necessity for immediacy of a standby power and light requirements.

Communication System is a plus; essential but not to overdesign because of the cost factor.

260 Discussed smoke control system and stated that the air conditioning system could be designed and utilized as a smoke control system; fire dampers may be eliminated. Does not believe it practical that a completely supervised sprinkler system be combined with a completely supervised smoke detector system.

275 The prohibition on exhibits in lobbies and exits is too severe. Believe that a strict limitation on types and extent of exhibits may be a better solution.

Discussed the use of folding partitions to provide rated areas. Stated availability of rated folding partitions as a manufactured item.

290 Discussed double decker booths. Problem of sprinklers not being able to protect the interior of the booths. Not practical to require sprinkler heads inside the booths areas, therefore an alternate means of fire suppression is indicated. A policy needs to be established.

Discussed smoke vents and pointed out that Uniform Building Code does not require this. Stated that the the air conditioning system could be designed to incorporate smoke removal.

CONTINUED ON PAGE SIX

TAPE 100
Side 1

305 Exiting is a problem that must be worked out with preliminary plans.

335

Levy: San Francisco Building Code permits assembly below grade in excess of 1,000 with only sprinkler system as the main requirement. The code change was requested by the Board in order to provide equivalent safety in line with requirements of UBC.

A variance request is not in order since the code already permits this. The purpose of the code change consideration is to provide equivalent safety in the spirit of the requirements of UBC. Other levels of safety might be considered by the Board. With regard to the handicapped, believe that elevators can be used and that ramps may not be required.

380

Engler: Ramps or elevators may be used for the handicapped. The State legislation states that we must provide access facilities for the handicapped, but does not provide directions on how to get handicapped out of these facilities.

385

Carli: Expressed concern over the remoteness of smoke detectors in the high ceilings and the possibility of their not being activated during a fire directly above.

Early warning devices probably will be necessary, the problem is the activation of these sprinklers.

410

J.Degenkolb: Agrees with Chief Carli in the problem for activation of sprinklers in high ceilings. Cited the case of the fire in the Pantages Theatre where sprinklers directly over the fire did not go off because of their remoteness from the fire directly below.

CONTINUED ON PAGE SEVEN

410

Practically all other sprinklers were activated. Alternate means to activate the sprinklers must be provided.

420

Engler: Agreed with Mr. J. Degenkolb in regard to the use of rated partitions to provide refuge areas.

Discussed the use of folding partitions that are fire rated to provide rated areas to be used as refuge areas during a fire. Stated that folding partitions that are fire rated are available.

435

Levy: In regard to the use of rated partitions for refuge area, he cautioned that the entire exhibit hall may be used at one time.

440

Hatch: Discussed the history of the first YBC hearing that came before the Board. Expressed concern with the problem of exiting 20,000 under panic conditions which may or may not be connected with fire. Brought up problems of senior citizens, elderly or aged people who might have problems negotiating stairs and/or ramps. Either of these facilities have the same smoke problem in the event of fire.

470

H. Degenkolb: Does not believe in code writing for special buildings. Unusual projects require specific requirements that cannot be generalized.

480

Igoe: Apparently the major hangup is the ramp aspect. Advised the Board to look closely in this consideration. UBC requirements have the potential of being changed.

490

Gendler: Asked Levy to restate his main concerns.

CONTINUED ON PAGE EIGHT

500

Levy: Suggested to give equivalence to UBC requirements by means of increasing the safety beyond present code requirements. This needs a code change and it becomes necessary to agree to what degree to increase safety and specifically what items need to be included that are not covered in the present code.

525

Boas: Agrees with Chief Carli that the design must be done properly.

The Architect and the Engineer team has not been selected yet. The written part is to be judged quickly and they will hold oral examinations in a week or two. After selection of the Architect/Engineer, the first Step is to do schematics in order to determine the basic design concept. Flexibility is desirable.

540

Levy: Code sets broad limitations only. The problem is to establish some principles or guidelines.

550

Gendler: The proposal conforms generally to high-rise buildings since the equivalent safety is generally what is required for a high-rise package. Perhaps it should be up to the design team to determine the guidelines so long as equivalent safety is attained.

560

Levy: The time involved in executing a code change will take approximately 3 months minimum.

570

Igoe: Suggested that a joint committee be setup to provide the guidelines. The joint committee should consist of Chief Carli, Mr. Levy, Mr. J. Degenkolb, members of the design team and possibly members from the Board of Examiners.

CONTINUED ON PAGE NINE

575

Tomsick: Expressed concern over Mr. Boas' statement of schematics being prepared by the Architect team. The schematics must be based on something concrete. Desirable and necessary to have guidelines setup as soon as possible in order for the design team to get started.

590

J. Reem: Necessary to evaluate the criteria for hypothetical buildings. The basic provisions of the building code should be incorporated in the preliminary design. These provisions include specific items, earlier discussed, such as life safety, early detection, smoke control system, in-house fire brigade, etc.

610

Carli: It is necessary to have the code change now.

615

H. Degenkolb: The client is CCSF, perhaps the code change should be deferred and guidelines provided instead at this time. The joint committee could be appointed to go over the material and make the proper recommendations for these guidelines. Questioned Mr. Levy as to what he meant by maximum credible earthquake in his report. Mr. Levy responded that it was designed to provide safety for the public and to insure operational usage of the structure for safety purposes.

630

Gendler: Requested that a motion be made to setup a guidelines committee.

635

Carli: Important to have technical people involved in the committee that are not directly involved with the project.

CONTINUED ON PAGE TEN

648

Levy: There should be no problems as for using two members of the Board in this committee.

650

H. Degenkolb: Motion as follows: Since the Board anticipates a code change in general terms, that a committee be formed to provide guidelines for this purpose.

The code change should be deferred until these guidelines can be given to the designer of the facilities. These guidelines shall include fire protection, smoke consideration, exiting means and control, sprinklering consideration for panic condition, etc. The Technical Committee should report back to the Board in two weeks.

670 Motion seconded and passed unanimously.

GENERAL BOARD DISCUSSION

Further discussions were heard regarding the setting-up of procedure and personnel making up the committee.

685 It was determined that the personnel be as follows; Chief Carli, R. C. Levy, J. Degenkolb, John Quinn, H. Degenkolb and G. Gendler representing the Board.

720 Later addition was proposed by Mr. Levy to include Mr. Kenealy to provide legal guidance for the Committee.

The time for the first meeting of this committee will be Monday April 11, 1977 at 9:30 AM in Mr. H. Degenkolb's office.

725 The next meeting of the Board of Examiners will be April 18, 1977 at 7 PM in Room 282 City Hall.

CONTINUED ON PAGE ELEVEN

730

Chief Carli requested of Mr. Kenealy the following:

If whether or not his authority to grant alternate materials and protection pursuant to Title 19 includes the authority to increase occupant limits, and requested a written interpretation on this from the City Attorney's Office.

760

Kenealy: On the basis of reasonable alternatives provided, he will write such an interpretation for Chief Carli.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 PM

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

MC/ma

cc: Board of Examiners
City Librarian

SF
P8S 3S
#1
4/18/77

SF Public Library

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AGENDA

April 18, 1977

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of January 24, 1977

OLD BUSINESS

3. (76-20) Its the continuance from April 4, 1977 meeting.

   Procedure for Code Change for Public Assembly Below Grade in Excess of 1000 Persons.

4. (72-17) Audio Alert Corp: Request for further extension of time of Provisional Approval 900 A40.1

NEW BUSINESS

5. (77-3) Howell Construction Products Co.: Product approval for the use of the Howell Underpinning Anchor for sloping foundation sills; variance on Section 2905.D.2, San Francisco Building Code.

SF
P85.35
#2
9-6-77

SF Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

September 6, 1977

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler (Chairman), Whittaker, Camissa, Degenkolb,

Secretary: Mr. Levy, Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection
BBI: Mr. Franklin Lew
Fire Dept: Chief Charles W. Carli, Inspector Gustafson

TAPE 1
Side 1

000 Meeting called to order by Mr. Gendler at 7:10 PM.

Mr. Gendler announced the passing of Mr. Hatch, and asked for a moment of silence in his memory.

008 Agenda adopted. Mr. Gendler added an item: Mr. Levy to give a report on the progress of the weekly meetings being held between BBI and the designers on the YBC project.

014 Chief Carli wanted minutes of August 1, 1977 meeting reworded (QTape 830) to stress his emphasis that "the exit design for the building should be based on the assumption of total occupancy in all areas of the building." Minutes as amended adopted unanimously.

024 Levy Gave report on YBC meetings. Meetings being held at 2 levels:
1. Between BBI staff (including Mr. Levy), architects, and their consultants on general issues.
2. Between BBI plan checking personnel and architects on more detailed issues.

Items requiring Board action have been identified. BBI and architects are trying to reach concurrence on these items where possible, however, the Board will still act on them.

"Tivoli Garden" type treatment possible for roof. Board will see, and may comment on, such proposals, but it is not expected that Board action will be required.

Mr. Gendler asked if a new architectural member will be on board before the forthcoming meeting on YBC. Mr. Levy was hopeful, but not optimistic.

045 Levy Also mentioned that the matter of electrical sales is progressing. Extremely complex issue. A proposed draft of legislation may be possible after another 3 meetings. Mr. Camissa asked if minutes of thesemeetings are available. He and Mr. Gendler wanted them. Mr. Levy to supply.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

NEW BUSINESS

(77-8) Item 3 Fisher-Friedman Associates, Architects. Request for Variance, Sec. 2101, SFBC; rated interior load bearing construction; The Golden Gateway Center.

070 Levy Project is located in Fire Zone, where Type 5 construction is not permitted. Applicant proposes a building with incombustible 1-hr exterior walls, and 1-hr combustible interior walls and floors. Also to be provided, but not required by Code, are a sprinkler system and a supervised POC system.

Mr. Levy is opposed to the request. He agrees the sprinkler and POC systems probably provides equivalent fire safety. However, he is concerned with the problems such a hybrid construction would present to code administration. This request, if granted, may lead to the blurring of the distinctions between types of construction, and consequent confusion in the requirements unique to each type.

098 Carli Chief Carli agrees with Mr. Levy. This proposal will open the door to erosion of construction type requirements, and should not be granted. He acknowledges that equivalent fire safety would be provided by the sprinklers and POC system.

110 Jim Pierce Mr. Pierce, project manager for Golden Gateway North, speaks. The issue has significant economic effect on the development. He believes the project is unique enough that the variance would not be a precedent for other projects.

120 Steve Haine Mr. Haine, from the office of Fisher-Friedman, speaks. He describes the project - location, general layout. Design is continuation of previous Golden Gateway designs. 50 residences per block. Project to be built in 3 separate phases.

140 Goldberg Mr. Goldberg, consultant, speaks. He discusses philosophy of Fire Zones. Objective is to prevent spreading of fire to neighboring structures, not against internal burnout. Types 1 thru 4 construction, permitted in a fire zone, have only one consistent criteria: that exterior walls be incombustible. All other characteristics may vary. The proposed project meets this criteria.

This project is on the edge of the fire zone. Fire zone boundaries are not inviolate. In an earlier time, the Fillmore district was a more commercial area with intensive developments, and was included in the fire zone. When the Western Addition projects came in, with its less intensive development of the land, the area was taken out of the fire zone. The proposed development falls into a similar category.

205 There are 6 unique conditions in this project that would likely preclude a variance from setting a precedent for other projects.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

205
1. "H" occupancy.
2. Full block development and isolation.
3. 1-hr incombustible exterior wall construction.
4. 1-hr construction throughout.
5. Supervised sprinkler system.
6. Supervised products-of-combustion detector system.

Fire retardant treated wood is now permitted in non-bearing walls of type 4 construction. The treatment retards fire spread, but ultimately contributes the same BTU to a fire as untreated wood. Type 4 construction is thus already compromised vis-a-vis historical form.

232 Levy — Mr. Levy is against additional breeching of the concept of incombustible construction. Why not build as a Type 3? Mr. Goldberg has implied that if they must go Type 3, then will not provide sprinklers. However, sprinklers are not infallible over the life of the building, while in-place construction will remain constant.

247 Carli — Chief Carli restates confidence in fire safety equivalence; just does not like to see Code violated.

255 Goldberg — Mr. Goldberg says to view proposal as a "system" replacing incombustibility, not merely replacing metal studs with wood studs. The "system" emphasizes early warning (supervised POC system), and suppression (sprinkler system).

265 Degenkolb — Mr. Degenkolb asks Chief Carli if this project could present unusual firefighting problems. Chief Carli does not think so - describes probable Fire Department procedure for this project.

276 Degenkolb — Has anyone checked on possible effect on the City's fire insurance classification? Mr. Goldberg said the NFPA will tolerate almost anything as long as sprinklers are provided. Mr. Pierce said the insurance premiums for the building in this configuration will be slightly lower than if it were Type 4 construction.

BOARD DISCUSSION.

335 Whittaker — Motions to grant variance in accordance with applicant's letter.

340 Degenkolb — Seconds motion, but with the inclusion of the six "unique" conditions cited by Mr. Goldberg - see Tape 205. Additionally, this is a one-time only variance.

360 — Motion as amended pass unanimously.

360 Goldberg — Passed out a sketch showing a double-stud 2-hr wood frame wall. He indicated this detail will be used for interior party walls.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

332 Degenkolb — Motions that 2-hr wood wall be allowed in common interior walls on this project.

Motion passed unanimously

(77-9) Item 4 — Skidmore, Owings & Merrill; San Francisco Performing Arts Center Concert Hall; Article 33, SFBC. Configuration of public lobbies with monumental open stair; Sec. 1714, SFBC. Railing height in front of balcony seats; Request for Variance.

400 Levy — The two items in the request are not related, and should be considered separately. Applicant agrees. Railing item considered first.

The Code requires 42" high railings on balconies more than 30" above adjacent grade. Applicant is requesting a reduction in railing height to 30" in order to permit unobstructed sightlines for all seated patrons.

Mr. Levy states opposition to request. 30" height is obviously less safe than 42" height. Applicant has offered no equivalent safety features, such as a cross-aisle at the front of the balcony, or a shelf in front of the railing. The Board is not empowered to lessen code requirements, and must deny this request.

430 Carli — Agrees the proposed configuration is a hazard. Points out that Title 19 still uses the 73 UBC, which requires 36". Thus a 30" height violates State regulations. Recounts case where a student fell over a 36" high railing and was seriously injured.

445 Carl Shultz — Mr. Shultz of SOM speaks. Has researched theaters in other cities, other codes. 42" height is excessive. 76 UBC, London, Canadian codes require 30". Repeats arguments in Bolt Beranek and Newman report submitted with variance request.

460 Whittaker — What were arguments advanced in the 76 UBC change to 30"?

462 Norman Kornsand — Mr. Kornsand, of Rolf Jensen Associates, speaks. Was at ICBO Code Change Committee meeting when issue came up. Arguments same as in Beranek report.

474 Degenkolb — State Building Commission has been wrestling with this item for many years, but still has not changed requirement. SOM should check with OSHA and DIS. They still require 42". Should also check with your insurance carrier and attorney.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5

492 Degenkolb — Agrees with applicants reasoning, but cannot see how Board can approve. CAL/OSHA has heard same arguments, but will not agree. If applicant can get State to agree, then perhaps Board can act.

500 Whittaker — Agrees with Mr. Degenkolb.

502 Kornsand — Can Board grant conditional approval? This would help them before the State.

509 Levy — Applicant is asking for a variance, not an equivalence. Board should deny request without prejudice.

513 Camissa — What is situation at Opera House, Curran, Geary Theaters, etc? Levy replies they don't meet Code.

535 Levy — If applicant had proposed a "cowcatcher," Levy would have agreed, and this item would not have come to Board.

549 Carli — Agrees that Fire Department would accept cowcatcher type of equivalence.

553 Levy — Recommends a short recess to allow applicant to come up with acceptable equivalence. All agreed.

TAPE STOPPED.

555 Kornsand — Asks that request be tabled. Cannot make changes at this time due to need to discuss them with acoustic consultant. SOM will work with BBI to come up with acceptable equivalence.

570 Gendler — Motions that request be tabled, with the stipulation that if BBI and Fire Department can come to an agreement with applicant on equivalence, then the Board will remand request to the Superintendent for decision. If cannot come to agreement, then come back to Board for decision.

Motion passed unanimously.

580 Levy — Mr. Levy discusses the second part of SOM request. The Code requires that 3 story stairways be enclosed. Applicant requests leaving out enclosure and putting entire lobby under positive air pressure with respect to the auditorium.

Mr. Levy is opposed to request. Pressurization may not be maintained, and hence is not as safe and reliable as compartmentization.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6

608 Carli — Agrees with Mr. Levy's comments on the reliability of pressurization. Area is too big, and flow of people too great, to consider the lobby space as a stairwell. Should be enclosed. Chief Carli did note that the original version of YBC was approved with a similar stair arrangement. However, in that scheme, the seating was not fixed, and occupants would not be as likely to use those stairs for exiting during a fire.

625 Kornsand — Explains the total system. There are 3 basic components to the building: 1. Main hall; 2. Core or circulation corridor for access to hall; 3. 3-story high lobby with monumental stairs. The stairs can be considered as being "enclosed" by the lobby walls, since no maximum sizes are given in Code for stair landings or stairwell enclosures.

Mr. Kornsand conceded that there will be a bar on the first level of the "enclosure" and there is no providision for venting at the roof of the "enclosure." However, the bar will be built of entirely incombustible materials, and pressurization of the lobby will prevent smoke intrusion from the main hall, thus eliminating the need for venting.

The HVAC system for the lobby will be independent of the main hall. Outside air supply is used - no recirculation of air with main hall. The environmental control equipment is also used for pressurization of the lobby. This equipment, and hence pressurization, must be maintained for the building to be usable. Therefore pressurization will be reliably maintained.

The only combustible material in the main hall will be the seats; the lobby will have no combustible material, and the flame spreads of all finishes, including rugs, will be less than 25.

684 Levy — People do not normally congregate on stair landings. Walls and floors in Opera House are masonry. Theaters like Curran, Geary, etc., do not have HVAC system in operation - depends on opening side exit doors for adequate ventilation.

830 Carli — Again recommends denial. If variance is granted, the Board should put some conditions on BTU content and flame spread of the seats in the main hall.

860 Gendler — Asks for information on volume of gases given off by burning seats. If great enough, could offset the higher pressure in lobby, allowing smoke intrusion. Mr. Kornsand said cannot predict due to too many variables; i.e. size of fire, rate of release of gases, etc.

920 Gendler — Questions if 150 feet per minute of air velocity will be maintained when doors to street are opened.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 7

990 Gendler — Suggests approving a "package" consisting of
1. Sprinkler 3 levels of lobby.
2. Fire Department control on type of materials in seats.
3. Pressurization of lobby.

1052 Degenkolb — Motions that the Board looks favorably on the variance request for the open monumental stairway, subject to restrictions, some of which are quantitatively indefinite at this time, as follows:

1. Some logical method be formulated to determine the volume of pressurization air required to prevent the flow of smoke from the main hall to the lobby, for a reasonable size fire in the main hall.

2. The materials in the lobby and stairs be controlled to minimize flame or smoke spread irregardless of code requirements.

3. Sprinklered at all "landing" levels.

4. The materials in the seats and material furnishings shall have the minimum fuel contribution and smoke generation reasonable, regardless of code requirements.

The applicant and BBI are to work out mutually agreeable tests, specifications, etc and come back to the Board for further action.

Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 PM.

for Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

FL/ay
cc: Board of Examiners
City Librarian

P85 35
#2
11/15/77

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

November 15, 1977

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Balling, Canissa, Degenkolb (Acting Chairperson) Kennedy, Lera & Rockwell.

Mr. Lera present for Electrical Board; Mr. Balling present for Conflict of Interest item only.

Secretary: Mr. Levy, Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection
Mr. Choy, Deputy Superintendent " " "

Fire Department: Chief Graham
Fire Inspector Gustafson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Messrs Gendler & Whittaker

TAPE 102
Side 2

000 Meeting called to order at 7:10 PM.
Mr. Levy advised the Board of the long agenda and the need to move right along in order to hear all the items. Suggested that if all items can be heard there may be no need for another meeting for the balance of the year. There are no other pressing issues at hand. Advised that on the Chinese Hospital item he has received personal pleas from Supervisor Molinari, Assemblyman McCarthy, Senator Milton Marks and Philip Burton urging the Board for favorable consideration of that request.

010 The Agenda was moved, seconded and passed unanimously.

015 The following items on the October 3, 1977 Minutes were corrected:
Line 105: Mr. Somander instead of Mr. W. A. DiGiacomo.
Line 170: Delete name of Turner from Dinwiddie firm name.
Line 205: Correct spelling; idea.

The Minutes as corrected were moved, seconded and passed unanimously.

035 Mr. Levy discussed the Conflict of Interest Code and requirements relating to disclosure categories. Stated that the forms should be returned in time to be submitted approximately in mid-January for transmittal to the Board of Supervisors.

General Board discussion on requirements and implications.

080 Mr. Degenkolb moved to adopt Conflict of Interest Code in principle; if there are no objections or questions from any Board members within 3 weeks the item remains as adopted; for any members who objects to or questions any part of the code within the 3 week period a meeting will be arranged with Mr. Lazarus and Mr. Levy for resolution; if not then resolved and charges are indicated then a special meeting of the full Board will be called with the Deputy City Attorney in attendance.

Motion seconded and passed unanimously.

CONTINUED

OLD BUSINESS:

77-5 W. G. COLTHURST: 1455 MONTGOMERY STREET, APPLICATION NO. 443611, STAIR WINDERS IN H OCCUPANCY, SEC 3305.D; REQUEST FOR VARIANCE. (Continuance from August 1, 1977 Meeting).

090 Enomoto (Tak Enomoto, Design Architect) Explained basic configuration of the project and access and egress arrangement of each floor. Building is on an upslope site and the winders are only in one of the units. In this unit the 1st floor meets grade and the 2nd floor meets grade at the rear. The approved plans do not show winders, but the winders were installed by the Contractor for expediency. This is a condominium project and in some ways similar to single family occupancy for which winders are acceptable. 2 means of egress are provided at the lower floor with fire escape providing 2nd means from the upper floor.

115 Rockwell Inquired as to exact location of winders, 2nd means for upper floor, and proximity of fire escape window above grade.

140 Enomoto Window is approximately 2 feet above grade. Winders are all within one unit and is internal only.

145 Levy Cannot compare condominiums with private homes. Familiarity aspect is not relevant except in hotels.

158 Degenkolb Inquired if the other three apartments all have 2nd means of egress. The answer was affirmative and that just one apartment with winders and egress window approximately at grade.

160 Camissa Motion to grant variance was moved, seconded and passed unanimously.

77-7 FRANK WING; REQUEST FOR CODE INTERPRETATION, SEC. 210.12(c), SFEC. BOARD TO CONSIDER THE ELECTRICAL CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE'S DECISION DATED AUGUST 30, 1977 FOR FINAL ADJUDICATION. (BOARD OF EXAMINERS: ELECTRICAL) (Continuance from October 3, 1977 Meeting)

162 Levy This matter was referred to the Electrical Code Interpretation Committee for their opinion. The Committee met on August 23, 1977, where it was moved, seconded, and passed that the Bureau of Building Inspection's action was appropriate and the applicant's appeal was denied.

168 Levy Reviewed request for Mr. Rockwell who was not at that meeting.

177 Wing Have not downgraded the electrical system. The Committee's decision was based on nothing specific - just personal opinion. Started out with 20 amps and ended up with 35 amps when finished. What he has done is completely legal.

CONTINUED

200 Read from Sec. 210.12(c) of the San Francisco Electrical Code.
Hiltman Mr. Wing took 2 existing circuits and combined it into one circuit. The other circuit was used as a utility circuit. The old 660 watt rule used by Mr. Wing is no longer valid. There is as a result a higher connected load installed on one circuit in order to accommodate the utility circuit.

230 The code states that the number of receptacles installed on
Wing lighting circuits which are confined to 500 sq. feet is unlimited.

235 If the system is "less good" than before, that would be downgrad-
Rockwell ing. If it is "more good" then cannot see what is violated.

250 Stated that he was not aware of the additional kitchen circuit
Degenkolb from the last discussion.

255 There are 12 outlets in the 15 amp circuit. Otherwise would have
Wing to use 6 outlets.

260 Seems to be ungrading with 12 outlets on one circuit and new line
Camissa for kitchen circuit.

275 There is limitation on outlets on a new circuit except under 500
Hiltman sq. ft.

Mr. Wing responded that the area is under 500 sq. ft.

295 The Code is not clear. There is no present hazard. Benefit of
Rockwell the doubt should be given otherwise it would be unreasonable.

300 This is not a one-job approval request. The job has been completed
Levy and the code requirements satisfied. This is not a question of hardship on a particular job. What Mr. Wing is asking for is a Code change, in effect.

310 Moved concurrence withthe findings of theElectrical Code Interpre-
Kennedy tation Committee.

320 Stated he has reservations about this. Cannot understand the
Rockwell Electrical Code Interpretation Committee's decision since downgrading aspect is not apparent.

330 Stated that the same thing was done on another job and was approved
Wing by the former Chief, Electrical Inspection Division .

340 That argument is not relevant.
Levy

CONTINUED

348 Degenkolb — Board decision does not affect the apartment which is already done. The extra circuit was installed to satisfy Code requirements after the August 1, 1977 meeting. Recommended concurrence with ECIC findings.

350 — Kennedy's motion for concurrence with the findings of ECIC was seconded and passed 3 to 2 as follows:
Ayes: Messrs Degenkolb, Kennedy & Lera
Nays: Messrs Rockwell & Camissa

355 Kennedy — Moved that there be Code change in order to clarify what is intended. This will be referred to the ECIC for their action. Seconded and passed unanimously.

76-20 — PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE FOR PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE IN EXCESS OF 1000 PERSONS. (Continuance from October 3, 1977 Meeting).

360 Igoe — Reviewed briefly the items that were resolved at the last meeting. Asked that the Board defer the fire protection item of the lobby area at this time. The area has been redesigned with a different type of structural system which willresolve the problem. The following items need approval of the Board:

1. High Rise Fire Safety System.
2. Elevator System.
3. Emergency Power System.
4. Automatic Sprinkler System - Exceptions.

370 Levy — Introduced Chief W. Graham to the Board who replaces Chief Carli, since retired.

380 Kornsand — Discussed the recall provisions for the elevators which will allow the "handicap" to use when the need arises. Smoke barriers are provided in plenum spaces in 5000 s.f. subdivisions. Suggest 10,000 s.f. division instead.

400 Levy — Has no real objections. The purpose of elevator handling is different from a high rise building. In this case, the emphasis is getting people up from hazard level instead of down. The problem of proper handicap handling is very important.

Discussion: Lobby as a 2 hour shaft. Elevator shaft is also 2 hrs. The 1 hr requirement relates only to high rise requirements.

425 Chief Graham — Asked about Fire Department accessibility to building and visibility of control center.
Mr. Richert indicated the various entry paths on a large scale floor plan and pointed out the relative visibility of the control center. Visibility may be lessened if certain areas are partitioned off.

CONTINUED

435 Degenkolb — What is the present intent for smoke removal? Mr. Richert replied that the design has not yet been finalized, but smoke removal and standby emergency power will be provided.

440 Richert — Discussed applicability of Sec. 1807.1.C.Communication System: No special problems.
Sec. 1807.1D.Elevator Safety Provision: Elevator on manual with override for the fire department.

450 Levy — Sec. 1807.1.D.1 Smoke Lobby: Stated that he has no objections in a 2 hr envelope. Arrangement is better than a vestibule.

455 Richert — Sec. 1807.1.E. Fire Sprinkler System: Requirements of Sec. 1807 will be exceeded.

460 Levy — The concept of water demand, control & supply has been agreed upon; there are other problems not resolved.

467 Degenkolb — Sec. 1807.1.F. Smoke Control Systems; has already been covered.
Sec. 1807.1.6. Fire Alarm System; has already been covered.
Sec. 1807.2 Permitted Reductions; Mr. Levy explained rationale for such permitted reductions.

Subsection (a)

475 Richert — Discussed operable walls and area usages. Ceiling heights vary from 9' to 22' in some areas of the meeting rooms. UL does not test for heights greater than 12 feet.

485 Degenkolb — Asked about flame spread and smoke density properties required.

490 Kornsand — Walls will probably be zero flame spread and zero smoke density. Mr. Richert stated that some of the walls may have vinyl covering.

495 Dengenkolb — Stated his concerns about the smoke density and flame spread problem with vinyl covered walls. May have to reconsider his previous motion.

500 Levy — Stated that he is not sure one can label a large wall. They should investigate what is available and if something that's labeled can be found then that's fine. They should come back to the Board after investigation. UL should be contacted.

510 — Mr. Degenkolb's previous motion should be rescinded and the item left for future consideration.

Subsection (b).

520 Richert — The large meeting room has appropriate smoke barriers in the above ceiling space. No combustibles will be in room.

CONTINUED

Subsection (c). Not applicable.

Subsection (d). 1 inch hose reels are provided.

Subsection (e). Not applicable.

Subsection (f). Applicable to dead end corridors only in areas 50 persons or less as agreed upon with Chief Carli.and Mr. Levy.

Subsection (g). Not applicable.

Subsection (h). Not applicable.

Subsection (i). Not applicable.

555 Degenkolb — Suggested the following wording for a motion: The Board agrees with the items in the Life Safety Program as applied to the project with the following exceptions and conditions:

SECTION 1807

1.B. Design & details have not been finalized.

1.D. Provide overrides in control room and lobby - Keyed for Fire Department.

1.E. Fire sprinkler system exceed requirements of Sec. 1807. However activation has not yet been resolved.

1.F. Details to be discussed.

2.(a). Non-combustible operable walls. Investigate and get best available. Rescind previous action.

2.(f). Applicable to dead end corridors only in areas 50 persons or less.

569 Camissa — Motion was moved, seconded and passed unanimously.

SECTION 2: EMERGENCY POWER LOADS

580 Kornsand — Items to be included are:
1. Time Factor
2. Whether load shedding is permitted and the time allowed for load shedding for different units.
3. Discuss the different systems taken off.

The size of the pumps are about 1500 gpm of about 75 to 100 horsepower. The size of the generator is around 2000 KW. The load shedding time for elevators may be about 2 to 3 minutes. At increased loads, some items will be taken off.

CONTINUED

590 Richert — Load shedding for elevators should be deleted.

595 Kornsand — They will not equip with load shedding for elevators, but will consult with their electrical engineering consultant and come back to the Board if necessary. There will be no load shedding at this time and it may not be needed.

625 Camissa — Motion to approve items under emergency power load with the deletion of load shedding for passenger elevators.

Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

SECTION 3: AUTOMATIC SPRINKERS; EXCEPTIONS

640 Kornsand — The two items are not to provide sprinklers at enclosed portion of stairways and in transformer and electrical equipment rooms. With regard to fire-bomb problem brought up by Degenkolb at the last meeting, believe that because the enclosures are 2, 3 and 4 hrs. fire rated any incendiary device will probably burn itself out since there is no fire load in these areas. The Fire Department will not go into electrical equipment rooms with water when power is on. There should be early-warning detection in lieu of sprinklers. Ground fault interruption is also provided.

650 Camissa — Why the selection of fixed temperature rate-of-rise detectors? Mr. Kornsand stated that it was selected for its fast acting potential.

655 Degenkolb — Does the emergency power go through the transformer room?
Richert: Not sure but will find out. It is a good question.
Degenkolb: Fire Department will not go into the transformer room until power is off.
Levy: The problem of what can be maintained in the emergency systems should be discussed separately and then referred back to the Board.
Degenkolb: The routing of emergency power should be considered. Is the intent to take sprinklers out of the outer lobby?
Richert: This is not intended but is not part of the discussion.

690 Rockwell — Agree that there is a high voltage hazard involved. Inquired as to the type of early warning devices proposed.

695 Kornsand — Smoke detector or ionization type smoke detector is OK for the main switch gear room and transformer room. The infra red type is not recommended.

700 Rockwell — Smoke detector concept is probably unsatisfactory due to possibility of false alarms. Alternative POC probably also not satisfactory. This problem should be addressed by the designers. More information is needed.

CONTINUED

720 Richert — Suggested that a motion be made that any proposed solution be subject to agreement with the Fire Department as to their preference. POC may not work due to various reasons.

730 Graham — In exiting from main exhibit area how far is it to the door going up?
Richert: To the 1st door there is a 12 ft. rise with a horizontal run of about 18 ft.
Graham: Are sprinklers within the hall space?
Richert: Yes - up to 1st door exit only.

740 Degenkolb — Move to accept in general, subject to Fire Department's approval of the type of sensors to be used and with the following conditions:

1. Routing of emergency power to be studied with the general concept referred back to the Board.
2. Question of sprinklers in the lobby area to be studied.
3. Alternate to sprinklers in generator rooms subject to approval of the Fire Department.

In general further input is needed for the 3 items.

Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

760 Igoe — Itemized the following future items to be considered by the Board:
1. Lobby area- final design.
2. Smoke removal and emergency ventilation system.
3. Automatic sprinkler locations and activation of.
4. Automatic suppression of telephone equipment.
5. Proper signal system.
6. Fire alarm system.
7. Fire Safety Program.

These items to be considered plus the items discussed tonight that needs further input.

On the matter of applicability of Fire Department jurisdiction, he has received a letter from the City Attorney's office to the effect that occupant loads for underground public assembly in excess of 1000 peopleare permissible when the local authority approves alternate measures affording protection equivalent to that provided by the Uniform Building Code.

NEW BUSINESS

77-11 — RICHARD G. HEGGIE: RENOVATION OF WORLD AFFAIRS CENTER BUILDING, 312 SUTTER STREET: ELECTRICAL SERVICE REQUIREMENTS, Sec. 220.4(c), SFEC; REQUEST FOR VARIANCE. (BOARD OF EXAMINERS: ELECTRICAL)

777 Levy — The electrical code requires that the general illumination unit load for office buildings be 5 watts per sq. ft. The applicant proposes to use 3.2 watts per s.f. equivalent to a total of 1200 amps. There is only 960 amps available which is less

CONTINUED

777 Levy — than 1200 amps actual load. The proposal is not sufficient and a denial is therefore recommended.

790 Hiltman — The connected load should not exceed 80% of the rated load. There is an inconsistency in the submitted calculations. 80% capacity indicates that a 1600 amp fuse disconnect is required.

820 Heggie — Introducted Mr. Powell of Crown Electric.

822 Powell — Described the function of the Center which handles political affairs for international groups. Major renovation of the old building is proposed with the required seismic upgrading. In addition to the commercial tenant, housing for 275 people will be provided. For the commercial tenant the electrical service is adequate. They are committed not to go above 1200 amps and will go on record to the effect that if the building is sold they will then increase the capacity per Mr. Levy's recommendation.

847 Hendler — (Jay Hendler, ROMA Architects). All systems meet requirements except that 3.2 watts per sq. ft. is requested instead of 5. A large cost factor of more than $40,000 is involved. Since this is a non-profit organiation, relief is sought. Energy savings will be effected as follows:

1. Decrease lighting requirements.
2. Use of high efficiency lighting fixtures.
3. Use of energy saving spots for corridor lighting.

There are presently 2 floors under temporary occupancy permit where the lighting levels are more than adequate. The 5 watt requirement is too high for office loads.

890 Powell — The average wattage will be 3.6 and the actual at 80% is 2.9 watts. They can demonstrate that they can stay within the 1200 amp capacity.

900 Camissa — Calculations in accordance with Sec. 220.4(c) requirements give 1285 amps as opposed to 1196 amps actual.

940 Levy — An extensive upgrading of the electrical system is involved. The entire electrical system is being changed, therefore they must bring it up to code. The 5 watts requirement should be increased 25% for continuous loading. Expressed concern over possible future changes since there can be no real control.

970 Heggie — They have a Citizen's Board which controls policies and makes obligations and committments.

CONTINUED

975 Levy — Board people will change. No committment can be assured to be permanently binding.

980 Rockwell — It is not clear that the code is wisdom. Appears to be arbitrary in this case. Energy savings was not considered at the time of code writing.

1000 Levy — The energy problem has been here for some time. The Code must necessarily be conservative. The Code also makes allowances for future changes. More things are now done electrically than before.

1030 Powell — 1285 amps includes 125% for continuous load

1035 Degenkolb — Read Mr. Hendler's letter, 3rd paragraph as follows: "If 5 watts per square foot were allowed for lighting of all office space, the total load as calculated per code (with no allowance for diversities of space use, and with an additional 25% of all continuous loads) would be approximately 1285 amps. The actual lighting loads, however, taken at 125% will not exceed 3.6 watts per square foot or a total of 1196 amps."

1050 — General discussion on how numbers were arrived at, whether continuous loads were applied, if the Code prescribe minimum were exceeded, capacity and tolerance allowable.

1070 Hiltman — Are the conductors sized to carry 1200 amps? Just changing the circuit breakers does not solve the problem.

1080 Camissa — Moved that the request for variance be denied.
Motion seconded and passed by 3 to 2 vote as follows:
Ayes: Camissa, Kennedy & Lera
Nays: Degenkolb & Rockwell

1085 Hendler — Requested Board consideration of the question of obtaining a temporary permit of occupancy.

1087 Degenkolb — This is an administrative procedure which will be handled between the applicant and Mr. Levy. The applicant should arrange a meeting with Mr. Levy for resolution.

77-12 — EDWARD D. MCCRARY: 45 FREMONT OFFICE BUILDING: Sec. 1705.C.2, Sec. 1807.1.(f) and Sec. 5139.1, SFBC: PLASTIC PNEUMATIC CONTROL TUBING (DEKORON FR) FOR USE IN CONTROLS OF LIFE SAFETY SYSTEM: REFERENCE, BOARD OF EXAMINERS' RULING (77-10) DATED OCTOBER 3, 1977.

1090 Levy — This is a different building from the previous request for the use of plastic pneumatic control tubing.

CONTINUED

1095 Fisher — (John Fisher, SOH) The test was witness in the Honeywell office. The lines were cut on a certain location with no effect on the balance of the system.

1110 Degenkolb — Is there a fail-safe feature?
Fisher: Yes. Made a sketch on the blackboard and demonstrated the independency of the horizontal runs at each floor level from other horizontal runs at other levels.

1120 DiGiacomo — (A DiGiacomo; Laros, Baum & Bolles): Supply and exhaust air on each floor. Under fire conditions the smoke dampers in the affected floor closes; all others remain open. The fire floor is isolated and pressure balance is maintained. If the tube is ruptured the damper will close. Rupture of any one line will not affect other floors. In case of failure, the pressure sensing device sounds an alarm. The "fail-safe" position is a closed position.

1145 Fisher — The code is unclear. Life-safety was not in effect at the time the Code was written. The Code requires that horizontal runs for Life-Safety runs had to be copper. However the assumption was made that the use of plastic tubing was legal by Code - most jobs are done this way. The building is completed and a temporary occupancy permit is needed at this time.

1160 Levy — Even if this was existing, it is a violation of approved plans. As far as he knows, approved plans of all the jobs processed call for metallic tubing.

1170 Digiacomo — System does not compromise intent of the Code.
Degenkolb: Copper deteriorates about as fast as tubing.
Rockwell: It is a fire safety problem. Discussed possibility of reopening lines. Smoke dampers can be reset, but fire dampers cannot due to closing of fusible link

1200 Levy. — If plastic tubg melts the fire damper's fusible link would activate. The Code is not specific.

1205 Camissa — Move to approve the applicants request for variance.
Motion was seconded and passed by 3 to 2 vote as follows:
Ayes: Degenkolb, Camissa & Lera
Nays: Kennedy & Rockwell.

1210 Levy — There is a bulletin or Code Ruling in effect and this should be adhered to. He will place this on the agenda for interpretation at the next Board meeting.'

77-13 — YUILL-THORNTON & LEVIKOW: CLIFT HOTEL MARQUEE, GEARY & TAYLOR STREETS: Sec. 4505.B and 4505.D, SFBC;REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

1215 Levy — This concerns the Clif Hotel Marquee, the thickness and projection of which is not according to Code. In researching, this would

CONTINUED

1212 Levy — not have been allowed by Code since at least 1920. This is not a life safety problem but a sidewalk encroachment which rightfully the Board of Supervisors should legislate.

1220 Tudury — (Michael Tudury, Yuill-Thornton & Levikow): The new marquee is 2/3 the width of the existing marquee. They are proposing 11 ft. thickness instead of 9 ft. allowed and projection of 11 ft. on a 12 ft. curb. It is possible to cut back, but however they are not changing the existing condition. They are replacing the existing marquee with a new marquee with the new with more thickness and projection about the same.

1250 Levy — The Code requires that when the horizontal clearance between a marquee and the curb line is less than 2 ft., the marquee must be at least 14 ft. above the curb. For such projection the marquee thickness cannot exceed 6 ft. This is really a legislated matter, not a safety matter. Recommend Board denial with referral to the Board of Supervisors.

1260 Rockwell — Question whether public interest would be served by strict conformance to the Code. The Board should be tempered by desire to see buildings kept in use.

1265 Levy — Question of encroachment on City property. Esthetics also involved. Should really go to the Board of Supervisors, but if this Board rules on the matter, that should be the end of it. The Fire Department is not affected by this.

1270 Rockwell — Move to grant variance. Public safety is not involved and this variance will serve public interest.
Motion seconded and passed unanimously.

77-14 — GARTH COLLIER, ZOE WORKS: PROPOSED APARTMENT HOUSE PROJECT, SEC EDDY AND BRODERICK STREETS: PASSIVE SOLAR HEATING SYSTEM: Sec. 1305.A, 1502.5 and 5131.A, SFBC: REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

1290 Levy — The applicant proposes the utilization of a "greenhouse" for the collection and distribution of solar energy for a housing development. Is sympathetic but there are code and safety problems as follows:

Exiting: Code requires a 1-hr corridor
Ventilation: Does not meet window requirement for light and ventilation for room opening into greenhouse. No ventilation from outside air.
Fire Stopping: Material going through walls and plenum space in apparently exposed ducts. A ducting system would be ok.
Systems Backup: Must maintain 70 degrees with certain ambient temperature. A full backup heating and hot water system is required.

CONTINUED

1310 Levy — The greenhouse must be designed with the Code in mind. At this point Mr. Levy passed out copies to the Board members of a letter from the Redevelopment Agency asking for the Board's favorable consideration.

1320 Graham — Expressed concern of the exiting arrangement and the possibility of fire travel to the living quarters.

1330 Delameter — (James Delameter, Delameter Partnership). Their company was hired by the Redevelopment Agency to work on this project as a pilot project for this type of solar energy utilization. At this point Mr. Colyer, Architect submitted a letter from the Northern American Chapter of the AIA on their acceptance of the concept.

1350 Colyer — Explained the exiting arrangement as through the garage to the street and a fire escape located off the master bedroom. There is no exiting through the solarium.
Graham: Needs 2 exits from each level.
Colyer: Has 2 exits from 2nd floor, and 1 exit from 1st. floor.
Levy: The 2nd exit must be through the solarium then. The exit corridor must be 1-hr until one gets to the street.

1370 Rockwell — Appears that each solarium is separated by 1 hr. separation for each unit. Each unit is therefore completely independent in all respects.

1380 Levy — It appears then that the exiting problem has been taken care of. The arrangement is acceptable if there is no storage in the solarium area. The use of the area should be clearly designated.

1395 Rockwell — The area could be labeled as a family room.

1400 Levy — On the matter of the ducts, is concerned that the walls are being used as a shaft and the space between the ceiling as a plenum.

1405 Colyer — This is a full ducted system. The drawings are diagrammatic only In addition a back-up system with full capacity will be provided.

1408 Levy — Recommend acceptance if that is the case but subject to review by BBI and a chance to come back to the Board. The only other problem is the ventilation.

1410 Colyer — The ventilation can be demonstrated by calculations to be more than adequate. They have complied with Code intent. They can prove that there are more air changes than provided by S.F. Code requirements.

1415 Allen — (Reed R Allen, Yanow & Bauer). There are 1 1/2 air changes per minute in the solarium due to natural convection. A 5 mile wind would provide one air change every 56 seconds which exceeds the

CONTINUED

1415 Allen — the Code. Essentially the room is being ventilated to an air shaft in the form of the solarium. They also have a mechanical back-up system. This will be a fail-safe open system with constant circulation.

1420 Levy — Expressed concern about the temperature in the solarium - especially from an open window.

1425 Allen — Air that is greater than 90 degree is drawn from the top of the solarium which is 8 to 10 feet above the windows. There is a constant flow of fresh air into and from the solarium. The air in the solarium is in constant circulation being drawn from the outside via underground ducts and hot air drawn off at the top. The incoming air is somewhat cooled by the underground ducting. In general the solarium air is virtually the same as the outside temperature at the window locations.

1475 Rockwell — The problem is in control of the circulating air. It is reasonable to expect that the air will move and that the room will be ventilated.

Colyer: The ambient air will be somewhat cooled before being introduced to the greenhouse.

1485 Levy — We must be reasonably sure that the unit is comfortable and adequately ventilated. Is concerned with the temperature aspect and needs some equivalent comparison.

1490 Degenkolb — Expressed concern on the security problem at the solarium area.

1492 Colyer — The solarium can be left open but the front door can be locked.

1494 Levy — Summarized the Bureau's position that the project may be acceptable based on a 1-hr separation provided at the front exitway (solarium), a fully ducted system, required back-ups provided and a favorable Board ruling on the equivalency of the ventilation.

1493 Colyer — In response to a question on the status of the project. Mr. Colyer replied that they are midway through construction documents for the proposed project at Broderick and Eddy streets.

1500 Rockwell — Move that the Board approve the request in principle, subject to proof of ventilation equivalence to BBI with the matter to be referred back to the Board if not acceptable to BBI.

Motion was seconded and passed unanimously

CONTINUED

77-15 FRED ROCHLIN; CHINESE HOSPITAL, 835 JACKSON STREET: 44-INCH WIDTH OF EXISTING STAIRS: Sec. 3305.B, EXCEPTION 2, SFBC, REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

1510 Levy This involves the conversion of an office building to a hospital and concerns the width of exit stairway. The San Francisco Building Code requires 60 inch width, however UBC and Title 19 require only a 44 inch width. The existing stairways are 44 inch; a 60 inch width is better obviously.

1520 Rockwell Question whether safety is involved.
Levy: This is difficult to assess. Some code changes will be necessary, ultimately.
Graham: The building is in compliance with Title 19 and is fully sprinklered. He has no objection.

1550 Richardi (Daniel Richardi; Chinese Hospital). Introduced members of the proponent team as follows:
David Low, Chinese Hospital
Herb Tracht, Architect
Cary Fong, Administrative Assistant to Supervisor Gordon Lau

1565 Richardi All other codes approve the 44 inch except the S.F.B.C. which requires 60 inch. In order to comply they must demolish one side of the building and redesign parts of several floors.

1570 Tracht The building is small with about 50,000 sf of area. The basement has exit to grade and 2 stairs. Ground story has exit to grade and 2 stairs. 2nd story has exit to grade, 2 stairs and connection to the adjacent building. The upper 3rd, 4th and 5th has exit by stairs alone and is designed as the main hospital floor area. The total number of beds are 59 for the three floors, therefore the load on the stairs would be very low. A preliminary estimate for the cost of providing a 60 inch wide stair is between $250,000 to $300,000.

1610 Levy Is there a horizontal separation on each floor?

1612 Tracht Yes, there is a horizontal separation in each floor. All floors are compartmentized. The exiting is in excess of total required by Code.

1640 Degenkolb Is the building required to be sprinklered?
Tracht: Yes - there are water curtains on 2 sides which are required.

1645 Levy He is not aware of any excess to code requirements. The access to grade is deficient on 3 floors.

CONTINUED

77-15 FRED ROCHLIN; CHINESE HOSPITAL, 835 JACKSON STREET: 44-INCH WIDTH OF EXISTING STAIRS: Sec. 3305.B, EXCEPTION 2, SFBC, REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

1510 Levy: This involves the conversion of an office building to a hospital and concerns the width of exit stairway. The San Francisco Building Code requires 60 inch width, however UBC and Title 19 require only a 44 inch width. The existing stairways are 44 inch; a 60 inch width is better obviously.

1520 Rockwell: Question whether safety is involved.
Levy: This is difficult to assess. Some code changes will be necessary, ultimately.
Graham: The building is in compliance with Title 19 and is fully sprinklered. He has no objection.

1550 Richardi: (Daniel Richardi; Chinese Hospital). Introduced members of the proponent team as follows:
David Low, Chinese Hospital
Herb Tracht, Architect
Cary Fong, Administrative Assistant to Supervisor Gordon Lau

1565 Richardi: All other codes approve the 44 inch except the S.F.B.C. which requires 60 inch. In order to comply they must demolish one side of the building and redesign parts of several floors.

1570 Tracht: The building is small with about 50,000 sf of area. The basement has exit to grade and 2 stairs. Ground story has exit to grade and 2 stairs. 2nd story has exit to grade, 2 stairs and connection to the adjacent building. The upper 3rd, 4th and 5th has exit by stairs alone and is designed as the main hospital floor area. The total number of beds are 59 for the three floors, therefore the load on the stairs would be very low. A preliminary estimate for the cost of providing a 60 inch wide stair is between $250,000 to $300,000.

1610 Levy: Is there a horizontal separation on each floor?

1612 Tracht: Yes, there is a horizontal separation in each floor. All floors are compartmentized. The exiting is in excess of total required by Code.

1640 Degenkolb: Is the building required to be sprinklered?
Tracht: Yes - there are water curtains on 2 sides which are required.

1645 Levy: He is not aware of any excess to code requirements. The access to grade is deficient on 3 floors.

CONTINUED

1650 Degenkolb — Suggested a motion to grant the variance in consideration of excess exiting providing, low occupancy of the floors and the horizontal separation of the floors.

1653 Canissa — So moved.

The motion was moved seconded and passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 PM.

Recorded: Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

cc: SFFD, Chief Graham
City Libarian

MC/ay

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

November 15, 1977

AGENDA ITEM	NAME	AFFILIATION
3	W. G. Colthurst	Attorney for Owner
3	T. Enomoto	Design Architect
4	Frank Wing	Electrical Contractor
5	John Igoe	Project Coordinator, Mayor's Office
5	Terri Richert	HOK
5	Norman Kornsand	Rolf Jensen & Associates
6	E. C. Hiltman	BBI, Electrical Inspector
6	Richard Heggie	World Affairs Council
6	Jay Hendler	ROMA Architects
6	David Powell	Crown Electric
7	Augustine A. DiGiacomo	Jaros, Baum & Bolles
7	Wm. Shuldiner	Bechtel Corp.
7	John L. Fisher	Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
7	Edward McCrary	Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
8	Michael Tudury	Yuill-Thornton & Levikow, AIA
9	Robert Colver	Zoe Works Architect
9	W. Ballard	Construction Company
9	Garth Collier	Zoe Works Architect
9	Reed R. Allen	Yanow & Bauer
9	James Delameter	Delameter Partnership
10	David K. Low	Chinese Hospital
10	Jacob Tracht	Chinese Hospital Architect
10	Daniel Richardi	Chinese Hospital
10	Cary Fong	Supervisor Gordon Lau, Adm. Asst.

SF
P85.35
#2
1-16-78

SF Dept of Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Minutes

January 16, 1978

AGENDA ITEM	NAME	AFFILIATION
	THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER	
4 (76-24)	Stanley P. Steinberg	John Portman & Associates
	John Dendy	John Portman & Associates
5 (77-9)	PERFORMING ARTS CENTER	
	Norman Kornsand	Rolf Jensen Associates
6 (78-1)	MR. L. WONG, 100 MOUNTAIN SPRING	
	Salvador Rodriguez	Structural Engineer
	Lawrence Wong	Owner
7 (78-2)	DAVID MILLER - ROLLAMATIC ROOFS	
	David Miller	
8 (78-3)	R. L. CARDINAUX, 701 SUTTER STREET BLDG.	
	Rene L. Cardinaux	Architect
	Alex Anolik	Owner

JAN 27 1978

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

January 16, 1978

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs Gendler (Chairman), Rockwell, Carrissa, Whittaker & Degenkolb

Secretary: Mr. Levy, Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection
Mr. Choy, Deputy Superintendent, " " "

Fire Department: Chief W. Graham

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Kennedy

TAPE 103
Side 1

000 Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM. Mr. Levy added Item 3A to consider how to handle the agenda in the case where there may be more applicants than time would permit for a hearing in a single opening.

010 The Agenda as amended was Moved, Second and Passed unanimously.

015 Gendler Noted that on page 11 of the November 15, 1977 Minutes, Tape 1210, 45 Fremont Item, Mr. Levy stated that he will place a code ruling concerning control of plastic covered control tubing for Board interpretation at the next Board meeting but this is not an agenda item.

Mr. Levy replied that because of the full agenda for the evening, he will place it at the next meeting without a full agenda.

The Minutes were moved, seconded and passed unanimously.

ITEM #3:CONFLICT OF INTEREST

016 Levy Reported that the City Attorney's Office has redrafted the Conflict of Interest Code as it applies to Board of Examiners' members. There seems to be no major objections. This redraft has gone to the Board of Supervisors and will be heard in the near future.

ITEM #3A:AGENDA; TIME LIMITATION AND PRIORITY OF PLACEMENT

030 Levy There have been occasions when there are more applicants than there is time in a single evening. It's not fair to everyone concerned to squeeze in more items than time would allow, since the applicant and the Board alike would be forced to rush the presentation and the Board decision respectively in order to conclude the evening's business. The Board should aim for a 10:30 adjournment and he will schedule the agenda items accordingly. Special meetings for emergency items may be necessary for items left out because of the time constraint.

Continued

In the case of emergencies when timing is critical for the applicant, a special meeting would be called, say even in the afternoon if agreeable to the Board. In cases other than emergencies, the cases held due to size of agenda will be the first items under new business. All applications for Board hearings are accorded priority in the order of date and time received and this priority should be inviolate regardless of project size or importance. A rule change will be prepared by the Superintendent for adoption by the Board.

A case at hand is the Neiman-Marcus Project which is not on tonights' agenda. They need a decision before February 1, 1978 and asked if a special Board could meet on the 23rd or 30th of January to consider this item. Noted that the YBC item would not be ready for Board consideration until February 13, 1978.

The Board members as polled, tentatively agreed to a special meeting on January 30, 1978 to consider the Neiman-Marcus Project and a meeting on February 13, 1978 to consider the continuance of the YBC item.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 4
76-24 SIMON W. R. SNELLGROVE: THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, EXTERIOR SOFFITS OF GYPSUM BOARD SHEATHING: SECTIONS 4706.A, 4710.A, SFBC; REQUEST FOR VARIANCE. (Continuance from November 4, 1976 meeting.)

085 Levy This item was first heard in December 1976 and concerns gyp board exposed to weather in violation of Sections 4706.A and 4710.A. A testing program was requested of the applicant by the Board. Is concerned over three points of the Georgia Pacific submittal:

1. Relationship between 5/8" "Fire-Stop" and 5/8" "Soffit Board."

2. Assuming that these are the same, the type of material actually installed.

3. If material tested is actually the same as the material put up.

110. Gendler Asked applicant to describe the installation procedure, especially the nailing.

135 Steinberg (Stanley P. Steinberg, John Portman & Associates)
The material put up is the same as the material tested. Several names have been used in describing the material but these all identify the same material. Described the installation and nailing procedure.

Continued

The tests were run by the manufacturer but witnessed by Pittsburgh Testing Lab and consist of:

1. Adhesion Test.
2. Accelerated Aging Test
3. Wind-driven Test.

150 The material used in the test is identical to the material installed on the job. They can prove this if necessary. The material has been installed above and beyond the Spec's. The exterior soffit material was blue - coated to differentiate from other gyp board material used on the job.

160 Levy There is lack of normal labeling procedures to insure that material put up is the same as material tested.

166 Steinberg Material is labeled by the manufacturer. Conceded that they haven't taken a piece out of the job site to test for identicity. However is confident that can be proven to BBI satisfaction if needed.

170 Levy Expressed concern only for a general approval of such material if there is a lack of factory control. Will go alongwith a one-job approval since this is not a fire-safety item.

195 Whittaker Questioned necessity for labeling if UL labeled.

203 Rockwell On equivalence, there seems to be reasonable expectation of compliance. Can see no problems in this case.

210 Whittaker Moved that the item be granted as presented.

212 Camissa Stated that he should abstain from voting because he is currently working on a job with similar problems.

213 Degenkolb The job is not the same job, therefore Mr. Camissa should participate. All members in agreement.

215 Gendler Noted that the soffit board is used in all kinds of places. Would entertain consideration for a general approval.

218 Levy Objected to general approval since there is a problem of quality control. If quality of control could be effected by UL or a 3rd party then he would go along with it.

230 Whittaker Restated motion that the item be granted as presented.

240. Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Continued

ITEM 5
77-9

CARL A. SCHOLZ; PERFORMING ARTS CENTER: STAIRWAY ENCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS; SECTION 3308, SFBC; REQUEST FOR VARIANCE. (Continuance from September 6, 1977 meeting).

245
Levy

Described the item under discussion as it concerns:

1. Volume of smoke from reasonable size fire to prevent flow of smoke from hall to lobby.

2. Materials in lobby & stairs be controlled to minimize flame or smoke.

3. Sprinkler at all landing levels (to include under stairs.)

4. Materials in seats and furniture; fuel contribution and smoke generation aspect.

The applicant at the previous Board meeting were instructed to work with BBI and the Fire Department and effect an acceptable solution and then come back to the Board. Several meetings have been held and the submitted copy is the conclusion of applicant.

Stated his concerns were the method of computation and rationale for using the 25% obscuration assumption. Will someone seating in his seat at maximum travel distance be able to see the exit lights? Agreed the neoprene should be used based on its excellent burning characteristics and if used, should be satisfactory. Noted also that the requirement for sprinklers at landing levels should also extend to stair soffits.

270
Kornsand

(Norman Kornsand, Rolf Jensen & Associates)
Described method of calculation of smoke control. They have reviewed slides taken during the fire test. At 40% obscuration can see opposite wall clearly. Measurement by photo-cell and described that 25% obscuration means that 75% of the light is going through. A UL test dated 1965 showed that at 80% obscuration the exit light was still visible. Therefore the 25% criteria is conservative. Added that other test methods are available, but that the Smoke Density Method is obsolete.

300
Levy

Could a person seated 100 feet away see the exit light at 25% obscuration?

310
Kornsand

Yes - in his opinion.
Then proceeded to explain the mechanics of the obscuration rationale which deals with the amount of light going through the air medium regardless of length of travel.

Agreed with the necessity for providing sprinklers at the stair soffits.

Continued

Discussed in general the smoke obscuration data and method as detailed in their report. Neoprene will be used for the chairs.

360 Degenkolb — Moved that the variance be granted with 4 conditions:

1. Strict control of materials in lobby and stairs to minimize flame or smoke spread beyond code requirements.
2. Sprinklering at all "landing"levels and soffit of stairs.
3. Seats and material furnishings to have minimum fuel contribution and smoke generation reasonable beyond code requirements. Neoprene is understood to be used for chairs.
4. S.O.M. assurances in their January 5, 1978 letter shall be adhered to.

380 — Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 6 78-1 — MR. & MRS. L. WONG: 100 MOUNTAIN SPRING; APPLICATION NO. 7707854; SECTIONS 1305.A, 1405, SFBC; REQUEST FOR VARIANCE, DEPTH OF REAR DECK.

390 Levy — Section 1305.A.2 limits the depth of the deck for H occupancies to 7 ft. Section 1405.A.2 refers back to the same section for single family or I occupancies. The reason for the limitation is for legal light and air.

405 S.Rodriquez — (Salvador Rodriquez, Structural Engineer) Stated that he is the responsible design professional for the project.

The deck is essentially a solid deck with gaps for drainage. The building is sited on a downslope but with the configuration of the building and location of the adjacent buildings, there will be no barrier to lighting.

420 Levy — There is the question of the amount of light. The ventilation is not applicable in this case.

430 Rockwell — Questioned that the lighting is a problem since the deck is some 15 feet above grade.

440 Gendler — Discussed the number of bedrooms and required window coverages at the level below the deck. Pointed out that according to the Code requirements, the building has twice the window area required on the minimum case.

Continued

470 Rockwell — In this case the street frontage is low.

485 Rodriquez — They have received a variance from Planning granting them a 9' deck, which is needed for an adequate sundeck. More than ample windows have been provided.

Under Sec. 204A the Board has the authority to grant if the condition is not less safe or less desirable.

500 Levy — The Building Code is more specific in its requirements and it is not unusual that a Planning variance proves to be in violation of Building Code requirements and vice-versa.

510 Whittaker — Motion that the request be granted as stated

Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

ITEM 7 78-2 — DAVID MILLER; ROLLAMATIC ROOFS: TABLE No. 17-E, LIMITATION OF COMBUSTIBLE GLAZING, SFBC; REQUEST FOR VARIANCE

515 Levy — This is a request for a general variance for Rollamatic Roofs without area limitation. A 1968 Hearing granted Rollamatic Roofs for single family use with the following limitations:

1. 300 s.f. max and limit one to a building.
2. If more than 1, must be 20 feet apart.
3. Must be 2 ft. from property line.
4. 1/20th of the Rollamatic Roof area must be vented.
5. Must provide for twice the light required.

The applicant is requesting for a general variance as follows:

1. Fiberglass panels (sandwich)
2. Unlimited area.
3. Occupancies undefined.

The Code regulates plastics in skylights per Table 17E. Smoke detectors is not the answer. Asked applicant to explain apparent discrepancy in the designation of Flame Spread Rating as 0-25 in one part of the submittal and 200 in another part.

514 Graham — Sprinklers on roof may be needed.

515 Miller — (David Miller - Rollamatic Roofs, Inc.) The plastic skylight material was described as a sandwich panel of inherent structural strength much greater than tempered glass. Class 1 material used. The fiberglass panel has passed

Continued

a burn test which shows that only the top sheet is burnt and the bottom sheet is OK. The air space between is 2-3/4 inches. There is no problem with structural integrity of these panels.

Is requesting that approval be granted for such use for unlimited area since only Class 1 material will be used and which has been tested to be incombustible.

They have installed elsewhere Rollamatic Roofs up to 3000 s.f. Units can be made operable by electricity, manually or by smoke detectors. No plastic material is involved below. When there is smoke, the unit opens up and area is wide open. Therefore there should be no objection from a fire-safety standpoint.

On electric motor operation there is little chance of wire in conduit being burnt. The smoke detector automatically opens the unit. Is proposing smoke detectors as a part of the request.

530 Whittaker — If the roof is not open, it would be an incombustible assembly anyway. Expressed concern on the unlimited area requested.

540 Degenkolb — 50% of the roof must be in fixed glass with fiber-glass panels drawn over the glass if 50% operable.

545 Graham — Concerned about walking on roof area when in fire mode.

565 Miller — If motor doesn't work roof can be pushed open manually. Is currently designing job in Nevada of 22,000 s.f. with 1/2 openable. The entire area will be in plexiglass.

590 Rockwell — Is dismayed at the broadness of the request. Cannot go along with the unlimited area aspect.

592 Levy — A 0-25 rating does not mean incombustible. The Code permits unlimited use of glass for roofs - There is also no limitation in UBC - In theory, one can build an all glass roof. A Code change is now being studied to limit such use. It's not a question of what's installed in other parts of the country. It is the performance of these installations under fire conditions that is pertinent. Testing program for various aspects is in order. Do not know whether the sandwich panels have SFM or ICBO approvals. The opening of the roofs should be controlled by the Fire Detector and should not be automatically controlled unless acceptable to the Fire Department.

Code does not permit in A,B,D,E & J2 occupancies. The degree allowable in other occupancies is in question if different from Table 17E.

Continued

640 Miller — The fiberglass material has ICBO and SFM approval. The panels are of aluminum grid core but the main frame is steel-box frame section.

670 Rockwell — The request is not clearly defined. What is needed is a specific request defining occupancy, type of contruction, height and area. This request should be denied.

690 Levy — Defined combustible material as meeting the Muffle Furnace Test at 1200 degrees for 5 minutes. Aluminum does not meet incombustible standard per S.F. Building Code.

700 Gendler — How about a 1 job approval as problem comes up?

710 Levy — Difficult to sell product on that basis. Not good for applicant on a job-to-job basis. Board should decide what occupancies are allowable.

703 Rockwell — The applicant should come back with specific conditions such as occupancy, fire zone, type of construction, etc. The Board can only act on what is known.

750 Miller — Problem remains - approvals have been granted in some cases and denied in others. Need apecific guidance on approval criteria.

760 — The question of seeting up a special meeting with Levy, Graham and certain Board members was brought up by Mr. Gendler and Mr. Levy stated that he would need guidelines before he can set up meeting.

776 Levy — The Rollamatic Roof becomes roofing material in the retracted position.

790 Rockwell — This is difficult to assess, and do not believe that the request can be settled by the Board at this time.

800 Rockwell — Moved to deny the request for variance without prejudice until the applicant can come back to the Board with more specifics, more research findings and pertinent basis for approvals by other jurisdictions.

Mr. Levy suggested to table the request instead of denying the request and the motion was so amended.

850 Degenkolb — Moved to table the request as motioned by Mr. Rockwell

Motion seconded and passed unanimously.

Continued

ITEM 8
78-3

R. L. CARDINAUX: 701 SUTTER STREET: APPLICATION No. 7708381; SECTION 1901, SFBC; INCOMBUSTIBLE FIRE RATED ASSEMBLY: REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

860
Levy

Discussed code requirements for a Type 2-B building wherein rated partitions shall be of incombustible fire-resistive construction except that 1-hr rated non bearing partitions may contain fire-retardant treated wood within the assembly. Mr. Cardinaux is requesting that the building be considered incombustible by the use of extra covering protection on the existing floor joist along with sprinklers where sprinklers are not required. Involves all floors and roof - clear code violation by definition of Type 2 building.

880
Cardinaux

(Rene L. Cardinaux, Architect)
The building is already existing and economic restrictions limit exact conformance to current codes. The building has reinforced masonry for exterior walls with 3x16 floor joist system fire-protected for 1-hr protection. Will provide rigid steel frames to satisfy lateral force requirements, a new stairwall and smoke tower, new elevator and shaft, etc. The building does not require a sprinkler system but is proposing that the sprinkler system be considered in lieu of the incombustibility requirements for a Type 2B building.

898

Occupancy change is from H to F2. The lateral will be provided as needed and fire protection provided as needed to give the 2-hr rating for a Type 2B building.

905
Levy

When there's an occupancy change, all requirements must be met. The floors and roof are combustible. The building is really a Type 3 building, although overheight. Agreed that the building is not required to meet Life-Safety and sprinklers are not required for other purposes. Normally, Table 5 would allow 6 instead of 5 stories for 1-hr additional protection, but this is a 7 stories building. Suggest that applicant use 6 stories and vacate 7th as a possible alternative. Would seriously object to a Type 2B classification with combustible floors.

945
Rockwell

Discussed the narrowness of the building - about 27' wide. The joists span all way across and is supported on incombustible construction. All major structural elements are incombustible except the wood floor, which is at variance.

960
Levy

Building is equivalent to Type 3. The Code is specific. If the Board can deem it equally as safe with added protection, can add 2 additional stories as Type 3.

980
Cardinaux

He can go either way. Will double protection below and meet safety intent of the Code.

Continued

1007 Levy. Needs 1 hr for 5 floors and with sprinklers, OK for 6 floors.

1014 Anolik (Alex Anolik, Owner of 701 Sutter Street) This is an old brick building and will be made beautiful. When acquired, was a condemned flea-bag type of hotel with numerous violations. If left as apartment would not have to do much to the building. It is his intent to change to F2 occupancy and make the building as safe as possible.

1035 Gendler If protected in the manner suggested, should be OK to grant the 2 additional floors.

1040 Levy Questioned the details of the proposed floor assembly. The entire assembly is 1-hour to begin with. The addition of the LW concrete is not necessary.

1045 Rockwell Move to accept the building as a Type 3 building with 2 additional floors permitted in consideration of High-Rise safety extras which are proposed to be provided with the existing wood floors and roof having 5/8 inch Type X Gyp Board on 3/16 joist and 1 hr. accoustical ceiling below along with a supervised sprinkler system on all floors and roof.

The Life-Safety extras are enumerated as follows:

1. Mechanical ventilation.
2. Master fail-safe release system for all building doors.
3. Supervised sprinklers by floor.
4. Fire Alarm by floor.
5. New stairwell and smoke tower.
6. Elevators at 100% compliance.

Motion seconded and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 PM.

Special meeting for consideration of Neiman-Marcus Project set for Monday, January 30, 1978.

Regular meeting set for Monday, February 13, 1978.

Recorded:

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

MC/ay
cc: Board of Examiners
SFFD, Chief Graham
City Libarian

SF
Public
= Works
S 35
3-78

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

February 13, 1978

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler (Chairman), Rockwell, Cammisa, Whittaker, Degenkolb.

SECRETARY: Mr. R. C. Levy
BBI: MR. M. Choy
FIRE DEPARTMENT: Chief W. Graham

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. D. Kennedy

FEB 24 1978
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

TAPE 104
Side 1

000 Meeting called to order at 7:06 PM.

003 Adoption of Agenda with Item 6 placed ahead of Item 4. Item 5 is to be deferred until next regular meeting because the applicant was not notified sufficiently ahead of time. Agenda as amended was adopted unanimously.

015 Minutes of 1/16/78 approved as corrected unanimously.

020 Minutes of 1/30/78 corrected as follows:

Tape 082 Change name from Pitts to Burgee

Tape 211 Correct last sentence to read: "Suggested that the control valves for the display case sprinklers be placed in a locked box which would spread an alarm when opened, and send the alarm to the Central Station and retransmitted to the Fire Dept. when valves are closed."

Tape 360 Correct to read as follows: "Questions whether POC's should be outside the ducts. These ducts are part of the smoke removal system."

Minutes as corrected approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

78-5 Item 6 EDMUND G. BURGER, BURGER AND COPLANS INC.: BETEL PROJECT, 24TH STREET AND POTRERO AVENUE: FIRE ESCAPE LADDER: SECTION 3307.9, SFBC; REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

036 Levy This is a variance for 4 buildings on Section 3307.9 to omit ladder to the roof. Per Sec. 204.D the Board shall recommend approval only if such a variance will not result in a condition less safe and less desirable from the viewpoint of public welfare.

Per Section 3307.9 fire escapes must extend to the roof if the roof is less than 4 in 12 slope. The exception are Group I and Group H fire escapes serving 1 dwelling unit. Since these are H buildings the ladder to the roof is required.

Continued

There are 2 reasons for the ladder to the roof:

1. To allow firemen to get on the roof
2. A secondary escape route.

The applicant has 3 basic arguments:

1. Fire truck accessibility to inner court is not required since firemen can ingress on foot, if necessary to ladder to 1st balcony. The ladder to roof also provides a secondary escape route for those on the fire escape.

2. Safety hazard to children: This is not different from any other building in town. If there is a problem, guardrails can always be put up.

3. No code requirement for stairways to the roof on interior stairs for 3 stories. This is true since the Code was changed and the requirement now only applies to 4 stories or more. In 3 stories the interior stairs provide much safer exiting. The argument is not valid.

The Code makes an exception for fire escapes serving only 1 dwelling unit. The applicant would be allowed this if any of the fire escapes is in this category.

080 Graham — Ladder is required for firemen to get to the roof to fight fire if necessary. Ladder will also assist people on the 3rd floor who are trapped and can't get down. Drop ladder on one building drops straight down from 3rd floor to grade pass two openings. In case of fire at other levels the drop ladder will be useless to get down in. Regarding children on roof, the only way to get to the roof is from the 3rd story apartments. Cannot get there from the courtyard. For those reasons he is in favor of maintaining the ladder to the roof.

090 Burger — Greater hazards by having the ladders there. Fireman needs 3 story ladder to ladder to 3rd floor balcony. Long way up. Not a feasible way to fight a fire.

This is a subsidized family housing project. Lot of children with lots of roof areas with no guardrails. Added safety provided by ladder to roof if fire is coming out from windows below is questionable since there is another 2nd means of egress which is a stairway on the street side of the building. The drop ladder is the least desirable way to escape from the building. Would only be used if stairway is blocked on the street side.

Owner is asking that ladders to roof be not required primarily because of the possibility of kids getting on the roof and falling off.

Continued

105 Levy — Don't see the difference in hazard between this apartment house which has a couple of apartments that houses children. If they are that worry they could always put up a barricade.

110 Degenkolb — Section 1714 requires guardrails. Mr. Levy agreed.

115 Burger — 10 roof ladders on fire escapes are required by the Code and serves 2 units. 5 others serve only one unit and are not involved.

All buildings face the street with streets all around except Bldg. #3 which is fully sprinklered.

130 Rockwell — What is the rationale for equivalence.

Burger — The likelihood of children on roof is a lot greater hazard than fire. High concentration of children. Access from one of the apartments is through a doorway.

148 Rockwell — The question at hand is the determination of equivalent safety provided. Doubts that a variance can be granted based on the presence of an alternative hazard. What fire safety measures would allow equivalency?

Burger — Would be willing to provide other fire safety measures but don't know what exactly would be acceptable. Perhaps fire extinguishers in units could be provided.

150 Degenkolb — Noted that on drawings a fire escape is apparently going past openings. May be another code violation involved.

160 Burger — Openings are sprinklered so it's OK.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

165 — Discussion of exits, fire department access and possible other alternates. Possibility of use of Sungard (pole-type) ladder.

190 Rockwell — Question of importance of getting people (children to the roof) during fire emergency versus hazard of children on the roof once up there. Other alternatives may be possible.

Motion to table request without prejudice.

230 Degenkolb — Agrees that the Board should defer action until applicant can come up with a solution that would be acceptable as equivalence. Otherwise cannot lower safety per Code.

Motion seconded and passed unanimously.

Continued

Rockwell — Children falling off roofs are a real hazard. Guardrails does not work for unsupervised children.

240 Levy — This hazard is generally present in buildings 4 stories or more which requires a stairway to the roof.

245 Rockwell — The Code has taken into consideration the problem of handicapped people but should also consider ways to minimize the likelihood of people getting handicapped, especially children.

OLD BUSINESS

76-20 Item 4 — PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE FOR PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE IN EXCESS OF 1000 PERSONS (CONTINUANCE FROM NOVEMBER 15, 1977 MEETING.

260 Gendler — Material for this item was received on February 8, 1978. Suggested that material for a complex item like YBC should be in the hands of Board members about 14 days before. This would give the members time to review and study.

265 Levy — Apologized for the short time given the Board for review. Meetings were held up to the last due to the complexity of the problems. Agreed that not enough time was given and will try to submit material to the Board earlier in the future. 10 days normally and 14 days for complex issues.

270 Levy — Have applicant make presentation first in two parts: Administrative problems first, discuss that and then specific proposals and discuss.

INTERMISSION

360 Igoe — Have provided summary of actions to date. Apologized to Board for late submittal. Will try for 2 weeks prior submittal in the future.

In response to questions raised in Nov. 15 meeting a detail discussion of the emergency power system is included. It was also determined that there is to be no load shedding for elevators since this is an important part of the life safety egress system, especially for the handicapped. Moveable walls are also covered and a survey has been sent to all manufacturers of moveable walls for information regarding fire resistance, acoustical properties, burning characteristics, etc. This information will be provided to the Board.

The Electrical Switch Gear and Transformer Room detection system will be given to the Board upon completion. A ruling by BBI and the Fire Department is forthcoming on this and this item will be held in abeyance until then.

Continued

The Smoke Control System will be discussed tonight along with the automatic sprinkler system. The alarm activation system is based on the earliest notification possible for fire department response. They will go through the basis smoke control system and sprinkler system proposed and how other systems impact on this. The last item is the standard fire protection for the roof deck- the non-loadbearing portion of the roof.

380 Igoe — The next meeting tentative scheduled for March depends on how much ground is covered tonight. The administrative matter is a suggestion and a request to the Board to review the final EIR for the project prior to final approval actions. Following that action, the Board is requested to make a provisional approval subject to the acceptability of the fire management plans. A summary of this will be submitted for Board review first. The final fire management plan cannot be done until bids can be taken and the contract awarded. The request for review of the final EIR by the Board is upon advise of the City Attorney. The EIR is expected to be certified by the 1st. week in March. The Board has discretionaryreview powers and is proper for the Board to review prior to making the final decisions. The EIR primarily concerns economic factors but there is a section on safety covered.

410 Igoe — The Board's provisional approval must precede the approval of the Site Permit which is scheduled on or about the 1st. of May.

Introduced David Barreres, Rolf Jensen & Associates.

420 Barreres — Will cover Smoke Control System and the Sprinkler System- after that will cover the Early Alarm System. Providing smoke control throughout entire facility. Theory used is providing exhaust air from zones of fire origin and the surrounding areas will become pressurized positive to that area in order to maintain that area free of smoke and exhausting the smoke from the affected area as a general philosophy.

There are 11 zones of smoke operation in the Hall as listed in page 34.

440 Barreres — EXPLAINED THE OPERATION OF THE SYSTEM AND THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF THE DIFFERENT ZONES.

455 Barreres — The Smoke Control program for the lobby area comprises of 3 methods:

1. Activation of water flow.
2. Return duct smoke detection
3. Manual initiation at the Fire Dept. command station.

Continued

In Zones 1 through 6 when smoke is detected in the supply air duct the air handling units to that zone are shut-off. A positive pressure is programmed to be maintained in that zone against adjacent zones. The Lobby (Zone 6) is always pressurized positive against its adjacent zones.

475 GENERAL DISCUSSION on pressurization of different zoned areas, pressure on doors, effect of door opening on pressure, and the designated methods of smoke control.

500 Barreres Discussed the smoke control program for the following areas:

Lobby, Zone 6

Motorized dumpers seal off zone. Relief openings will automatically open to the Exhibit Hall for smoke control purposes.

Kitchen Area

Water flow
Manual initiation
Supplemental kitchen hood and duct system
Normally 100% supply and 100% exhaust and is normally negative to adjoining Zone 5. Under Smoke Control it goes on 100% exhaust with no supply.

Truck Dock, Zone 9

Normally 100% supply and 100% exhaust for CO problem. Have fire detection but no smoke detectors in this area. Doors which cut off the truck emergency pedestrian ramps are on motorized closures.

535 Barreres Exhibit Hall

Described smoke exhaust conditions.

The supply air ducts are used to serve the Exhibit Hall under normal conditions. There are no return air ducts in the Exhibit Hall space. Smoke exhaust fans are located in the plenum. Dampers are located above the supply air fan and below the smoke exhaust fan. Described dumper operation during smoke control made.

General

The Fire Department has the option to override control manually the smoke removal system.
The Exhibit Hall is negative to the adjacent areas, with positive air flow towards the exhibit hall.
The lobby will become positive under smoke control operation in the exhibit hall. Will provide relief openings at the trade emergency pedestrian ramps so that air can pass more freely.

Continued

580 Barreres — Because of possible excessive pressures on exit Exhibit Hall doors, variable pitch vane-axial fans are proposed to control the exhaust fans. The pressure on the door is limited to 15 pounds. (Refer to page 39 and 40).

585 Camissa — The system is programmed to maintain certain negative and positive pressures in the different zones. Would then be possible confusion if fires were to occur in more than 1 area. How would that affect the controlling of pressures in the different zones.

590 Kornsand — The Lobby is programmed to be positive overall. The Fire Department can override controls selectively at any time. This should not be a problem.

600 Levy — What is the capacity to exhaust in terms of number of air changes?

Mr. Barreres replied that the system is designed for 3 AC/hr. in the areas served.

610 Levy — Would like to know the rationale for 3 AC/hr. Is not clear whether it should be 3, 4 or 6.

BOARD DISCUSSION

* Size of exhaust fans at 40,000 cfm. 8 at 40 = 320,000 CFM exhaust. If all on will create excess pressure. Reduce to 10,000 cfm per fan for control of door openings. UBC recommends 6 AC/hr for smaller volumes.
* The Exhibit Hall has 9 million cf of space, a considerably larger space.

Gus Degenkolb 670 — 8 to 10 AC/hr. would mean oversizing ducts and blowers. 6 is OK for conventional duct size with larger blowers. With 9 million cf to work with, it becomes a matter of getting dilution to an acceptable level. By introducing an adequate supply of fresh air and free air through the open pedestrian ramp at low level, the system will work.

690 Kornsand — The free air through cracks in the doors are of approximately 65 sf.

700 Gendler — What happens with fire in the middle of the Exhibit Hall?

710 G. Degenkolb — 3 of the boys working and the others not. Presents a switching problem.

715 Richert — The operable walls in place presents a complex programming problem. With no operable wall in place problem is much less complex.

Continued

A single zone approach seems more fail-safe and is also a more conservative approach to the problem.

720 Degenkolb — Discussed requirements for pressures at doors and door latch. In summarizing do not believe that opening the doors is a major problem.

725 Richert — Is willing to adjust to accommodate Board decision on acceptable pressure on doors.

740 Levy — Stated that he is not critical of the proposed 3 AC, just concerned. Wanted the Board to be aware of it and be satisfied.

745 Degenkolb — Have been using 6 AC/hr on atrium type bldgs; 6 seems OK For 9 million ct and dilution, 4 seems reasonable.

750 Rockwell — Dilution has been discussed as adequate. Can that be determined against a criteria?

760 Degenkolb — That would depend on the smoke generated or type of display in the hall. 1% contamination was determined to be acceptable in McCormick Place fire test but is not clear what is meant by 1%.

Rockwell — General Discussion on possible rationale for number of air charges, height or volume of air involved as compared to normal stituations, air change requirements in garages where C-O concentration governs, location of inlets and outlets, comparative exhausting capacity in CFM per sf, etc.

815 Levy — Suggested that there be a condition or agreement that there will only be one operable wall. The transfer trade indicates that the intent is to have 2 operable walls in the future.

830 Igoe — Confirms that the intent was to put in a second operable wall when financing can permit. The center space is not sufficient for an event and will be used mainly as a buffer zone to provide ancillary servicing to the adjacent exhibit spaces. It was never intended to use this center space as an exhibit area.

850 Levy — A low occupant load should be imposed when both walls are in place.

855 Rockwell — With both walls in place there is a problem of getting the required air changes. There is no feasible way to remedy the situation by providing more supply.

880 Igoe — Certain controls can be utilized. One or more supply fans can be activated. There can also be restrictions on the occupant load. Suggested that this be considered an action item with the matter going back to the Board at the next meeting.

Continued

885 GENERAL DISCUSSION on air change rationale, exhaust capacity under automatic and manual operations, effect of stairways and ramp openings to provide make-up air, maintenance of differential pressures between areas, problem of smoke going up the stairs. The consensus was that there appears to be a discrepancy in arriving at the design assumption of 3 AC/hr.

965 Will refer the problem back to Hayakawa.
Kornsand

970 Because of the time problem must go on to the next item.
Gendler Suggested that the item be deferred until more material can be submitted.

Mr. Richert agreed.

980 Described the basic design concept of the sprinkler system for
Kornsand the Exhibit Hall. They are providing a loop around the main Exhibit Hall with feed mains between the pairs of arches. Branch lines are provided with sidewall sprinklers at T areas at 10 ft. centers which will provide a 10 x 10 pattern throughout. Sidewall sprinklers are located 10" below the ceiling slab. The distance between the arch pairs are 20 ft. There's a line of sidewall heads at each side of the arch. Heads are located below the lower level of the metal ducts with a heat collection device over the head for quicker activation.

1000 Referred to page 16 of the Report which shows the distribution
Kornsand in pattern from a single sidewall head located on the Tee. Discussed the distribution patterns as shown on pages 16 through 19 of the Report which shows very good coverage under various conditions. Line sprinklers are also provided under the low chord at each arch. In general a 10 x 10 sprinkler pattern is maintained throughout.

1040 Discussed response time or time of activation of the sprinklers.
Kornsand The tests ran after the McCormick Place fire shows 5 minutes activation time for 50' high ceiling and 2½ min. activation time for 30' ceiling height. YBC is at approx. 40' height. The difference in the activation time appears to be inconsistent with the heights involved but is probably attributable to a difference in fire scenario which cannot be defined. The response time for the proposed system for YBC can be reasonably assumed to be about 3½ minutes, something in between 2½ and 5 minutes.

1080 The sprinkler system is OK but the activation time is a problem
Levy

Continued

1085 Gendler — Will not be able to settle all the issues tonight. Requested that Mr. Igoe summarize the items needing resolution and set another meeting within the next few weeks.

1090 Igoe — Summarized the items as follows:

1. Smoke Control: Need calculations for the AC/hr. Controls for use of middle space-operable walls.
2. Automatic Sprinklers: OK
3. As per discussion tonight, additional information will be prepared.
4. Roof Deck Alternates: No problem, concepts have been cleared with BBI

Would desire the next meeting in the very early part of March. They are on a very tight time schedule. They have several more items to be added:

1. Fire Management during construction
2. Fire Management Program Summary
3. Proprietary vs Central Station Control System and hopefully,
4. Seismic risk

1100 Levy — The Seismic risk item would be more complex and take some time. Probably should be taken up at a following meeting.

1140 Gendler — The next meeting is set for Wednesday, March 1, 1978 and is to be limited to the YBC item only.

1145 Rockwell — Suggested that in future meetings that the applicant be permitted to make an overview type of presentation with the minimum of interruption from the Board unless absolutely pertinent and necessary. Seems necessary to speed things up and minimize time spent on digression.

The Board members and Mr. Levy concur on this procedure.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:15 pm.

Special meeting for YBC set for Thursday, March 1, 1978.

Recorded:

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

mc/ma
cc: Board of Examiners
SFFD, Chief Graham
City Librarian

SF
P&S 35
#2
3-1-78

SF Public Library
City Library
Docs

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

March 1, 1978

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs Gendler (Chairman), Rockwell, Cammisa, Kennedy, Degenkolb.

SECRETARY: R. C. Levy

BBI: M. Choy

SF Fire Dept: Chief W. Graham

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Whittaker

TAPE 104
Side 2

MAR 17 1978
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

000 Meeting called to order at 7:20 PM.

005 Adoption of agenda.
Moved, second, and passed unanimously.

007 Kornsand Minutes of 2/13/78 Meeting: The following corrections were read by Mr. Kornsand.

Tape 455: Correct first sentence to read: "The Smoke Control program for all areas is initiated by one of 3 methods."
Correct next to last sentence to read; "A positive pressure is programmed to be maintained in adjacent zones relative to the fire zones."

Tape 500: Correct 2nd line: "Zones 4A-7 & 5A-7."

Tape 535: Correct 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence to read; "Smoke exhaust fans are located above the plenum."
Correct 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence to read; "The Fire Department has the option to manually override and control the smoke removal system.

Tape 580: Correct paragraph to read; "Because of possible excessive pressures on Exhibit Hall exit doors, variable pitch vane-axial fans controlled by static pressure sensing devices will be used. The force to open the door is limited to 15 pounds."

Tape 710: Correct 1st sentence to read; "3 of the bays would be working while the others are not."

Tape 760: Correct 2nd sentence to read; "1% of contamination was determined to be acceptable in Canadian fire test....."

Tape 980: Correct 6th line to read: "Sidewall sprinklers are located 12" below the ceiling slab."

Continued

058 The Minutes of 2/13/78 Meeting as corrected were moved, seconded, and passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

76-20 Item 3 PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE FOR PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE IN EXCESS OF 1000 PERSONS (Continuance from February 13, 1978 meeting.)

060 Gendler Noted that Mr. Gus Degenkolb was not present. The applicant will make an overview presentation with the minimum of interruptions from the Board.

Mr. Levy noted that there are a number of items to be presented and that they should be taken up for Board consideration after the overview presentation, one at a time.

075 Igoe Overview Presentation by John Igoe, YBC Coordinator:

1. Lobby Roof Design: The previous space frame system has been changed to a structural truss system. The fire protection of the roof members will be discussed. Have reached a tentative agreement with BBI and SFFD on special protection requirements.

2. Central Station Supervisory Service: This system was requested by SFFD. Has had many meetings with Chief Graham and believe they are in substantive agreement.

3. Sprinkler System: Review the sprinkler system in the Exhibit Hall and discuss the location of sprinkler heads and will go into sprinkler pattern and coverage effectiveness.

4. Smoke Removal System:

   a. Clarify the air change picture. The new calculations showed that the fans needed to be upgraded to provide 4.02 air changes per hour.

   b. Fresh air supply.

   c. Air Handling of Middle Hall in emergency situations.

5. Activation of Sprinkler and Smoke Removal System: Will discuss the basic system and how it normally operates. An alternate to the basic system has been suggested by Mr. Levy and Chief Graham relating to early notification of the Fire Department.

110 Igoe 6. Will request Board consideration of 2 special meetings of specific Board members to consider the kitchen exhaust problem and the seismic design concept prior to the 4/19/78 Meeting.

Continued

120 Levy — Prior to the 4/19/78 Meeting, will they have the final EIR? Mr. Igoe replied affirmatively.

130 Richert — LOBBY ROOF DESIGN
The previous space frame design has been modified to a structural truss system with secondary bar joist members and steel deck with concrete topping. Have reached agreement with BBI and SFFD that the secondary members need not be fire-proofed but added protection in the form of mineral tile insulation in the suspended ceiling will be provided. The primary members will be fire protected as Type 1 construction. The secondary members will comply in general with Sec. 1806 where fire protection is not required due to height exceeding 20 feet in sprinklered buildings and 25 feet in unsprinklered buildings. In summary, they will provide in excess of Building Code requirements.

145 Levy — Agreed that the extra protection in the secondary members is a good idea.

155 Degenkolb — Is concerned with safety of the main lobby which is also the major exit. He is not convinced of the integrity of the lobby as an exit. Although it meets the Code, the Code was not written for an unusual building. The problem of security is also of concern in the glass wall design. Other areas are OK but the lobby is critical

180 Rockwell — The discussion of behavior of the glass wall in an earthquake situation is to be encouraged. The designer should review and further discuss this problem.

190 Richert — Suggested that they break this into 2 issues, the EQ issue and the fire protection issue.

195 Degenkolb — The seismic drift is significant and presents a bad EQ situation.

200 Richert — The glass wall is a curtain wall and has not been completely designed.

206 Levy — The applicant is not ready for the EQ issue. Suggest that the Board take up the fire protection issue first and to take up the EQ issue at the 4/19/78 meeting.

210 Cammisa — Moved to approve the fire protection procedure for the structural frame and defer the EQ issue until the next meeting.

Seconded and passed unanimously

Continued

215 Kornsand — CENTRAL STATION SUPERVISORY SERVICE
Will provide signal service and telephone service through a dispatch office to the FD. 2 signals will be given the FD, through Central Station and telephone alarm. The fire alert system will be activated by water flow or activation of detection devices. Has worked out requirements and details with FD personnel. This is the essence of the proposal.

230 Cammisa — Is the FD satisfied?
Chief Graham replied affirmatively.

232 Levy — Concurs with whatever the FD is satisfied with in this regard.

235 Cammisa — Moved to approve the Central Station Supervisory Service. Seconded and passed unanimously.

238 Kornsand — SPRINKLER SYSTEM DESIGN CONFIGURATION.
The system has been discussed at length before the Board at the last meeting and several meetings have been held with BBI and FD personnel. Believe that it is appropriate now to open the matter for questions.

240 Degenkolb — What was decided on double deck booths?

245 Igoe — Believe a separate secondary suppression system was considered.

250 Kornsand — Unlikely to occur in YBC. Should be handled as a separate item.

255 Levy — Approval should be based on no double deck booths permitted. If so, must go back to the Board.

260 Gendler — Noted that in the 20' arch width the entire duct area is unprotected.

265 Kornsand — The space is heavy concrete with metal distribution ducts. There are no combustibles. Explained the omission because of economics but also that the additional sprinklers will have an adverse effect on operation of heads providing protection on the floor. However, could provide the sprinklers. The heads are located 12" below the ceiling in the tees which is the preferred location for optimum distribution and operation.

300 Degenkolb — What is happening on the top?

305 Igoe — Nothing has been decided yet on topside development. There is a general agreement to provide drainage by potential users through the slabs.

Continued

305 Igoe Con't — There will be an average of 3' soil on top.
2 considerations for sanitary drainage:

1. Drain to sump and pump out.
2. Provide trough to other area and pump out.

Since topside structures are unknown at this time the penetrations required through the slabs cannot be anticipated.

320 Igoe — The topside developers are responsible for gas, electricity, and water. The storm drains are the only penetration considered so far.

325 Gendler — The concept is to drain one's own roof.

327 Degenkolb — The fire protection will be under the drainage.

328 Igoe — The drainage system is above the fire protected roof.

330 Degenkolb — Move to approve the sprinkler system as presented with restriction on double deck booths and special provisions required for penetration; being equivalent fire rating to be maintained, providing barriers and no poke-through permitted.

Seconded and passed unanimously.

SMOKE REMOVAL SYSTEM

350 Barreres — Have gone over and refigured the calculations. The number of air changes was originally not correct for 4. They have increased the size of the exhaust fans from 40,000 cfm to 70,000 cfm giving a maximum capacity of 560,000 cfm. The recalculated volume of the Exhibit Hall is 8,350,000 cf with the air change now calculated equal to 4.02.

They have modified the return air plenums, added dampers. The inlets for the return air fans are located just above the doorways. During smoke control operation the supply air and return air fan is deactivated. After a 30 second delay, the smoke exhaust fans are in operation. Additional dampers are added to accommodate supply air into the Exhibit Hall. The normal air supply areaway is utilized by ducting and opening and closing of dampers. Discussed concept of providing supply air through the return air plenums. The entire ventilation system is reversed during smoke control operation.

400 Kornsand — This is essentially a push-pull system with reverse air flow through the plenum. The air comes in under suction with no pressure on one side.

Barreres — The cfm per person is calculated to be about 30 cfm per person. This is double the code requirement of 15 cfm.

Continued

425 Levy — UBC now calls for 6 AC/hr. per the 1978 supplement. This however, probably relates to say 20' ceiling height not 40'.

430 Richert — Noted that the fans are located just above the plenum at each arch pair.

450 Barreres — Discussed the use of pressure sensing devices. The force to open the doors is limited to 15 pounds. If all doors are closed the maximum force required will go up to 24.3 pounds. If all doors are opened there would be reduced air flow through the return air plenum.

460 Degenkolb — Move to approve the Smoke Control System as presented.

Seconded and passed unanimously.

ACTIVATION OF SPRINKLER & SMOKE REMOVAL SYSTEM

470 Kornsand — The sprinkler system is adequate for detection, notification and activation. They have proposed a special detection system to increase sensitivity. This has been discussed with various meetings with BBI and the FD. The spacing and location of the Smoke Detector System has been utilized for maximum effectiveness.

At this point Mr. Kornsand handed out a system activation scenario dated 3/1/78 to the Board members as follows:

(SEE ATTACHED SHEET PAGE 5A)

Further discussion on the 2 scenarios presented:
Exhibit Hall in Use and Exhibit Hall Vacant.

510 Kornsand — The two issues is whether or not the smoke detection system is necessary and whether the operation is appropriate.

517 Levy — If not used, how and when will the FD be notified?

520 Kornsand — The sprinklers are activated in 3 1/2 minutes at which time the FD is notified. The FD could be notified prior to that by manual notification.

525 Richert — There is a manual alerting station at each exit stair with pull stations for trouble signal and fire alert. Also there are handsets for communication to the control center.

530 Levy — Experience has shown that invariably catastrophes have been caused by a sequence of mistakes. If he had a choice between smoke detection and sprinklers he would choose the smoke detection system first. The smoke is more critical and is of greater concern. Earlier fire warning will be given the FD. The Fire

Continued

EXHIBIT HALL IN USE

TIME	EVENT
0:00	Fire ignition
0:55	Smoke detection
2:00	Fire Brigade reports condition of search to control center
2:15	VIES initiation
2:30	Initiation of smoke control operation - Shut down of supply and return air fans - 30 second delay closing of supply and return air dampers
3:00	Smoke exhaust fans energized
3:30	Automatic sprinkler activation
6:00	Maximum Fire Department response time

EXHIBIT HALL VACANT

TIME	EVENT
0:00	Fire ignition
0:55	Smoke detection
3:30	Automatic sprinkler operation - Shut down of supply and return air fans - Supply and return air dampers operate
4:00	Smoke exhaust fans energized

530 Levy Con't — Brigade may not act properly. The smoke detection system activation may have a deleterious effect on sprinkler activation but do not believe the time delay involved would make this a critical item. Is in agreement with the scenarios as presented and believe it will work. Should not place entire reliance on a sprinkler system which is 40' high . Otherwise we are talking about 8 to 8 1/2 minutes for the AD to be in operation. The Fire Brigade can negate the automatic initiation of smoke control operation if necessary.

560 Kornsand — There is nothing wrong with the smoke detector system, but do not believe it is necessary. In a fully sprinklered system building there has never been a loss of life due to fires other than to the person or persons directly involved.

570 Levy — There has not been much experience with underground halls of 20,000 people. Should be conservative in this regard.

590 Rockwell — Expressed concern that this may be adding more than necessary since 2 kinds of alerting system are proposed.

620 Degenkolb — Brought up the problem of fires involving the burning of plastics where there is not much heat but a lot of smoke. What size fire will set off sprinklers in this case?

625 Kornsand — Cannot relate to plastic fires.

627 Degenkolb — How is visual surveillance handled?

629 Igoe — Have TV cameras, but does not cover the entire hall. Covers the exitways and meeting rooms in general. The main hall is covered also and the problem is minimized since it is wide open. The individual in the control room can view and recall the sequential panning of the seven cameras involved.

640 Degenkolb — How much money is involved?

650 Kornsand — About $60,000 not including annual maintenance.

660 Graham — The idea is to get the FD notified as quickly as possible. Recommend having both the smoke detection and sprinkler systems.

The smoke detection system is preferred by the FD and BBI over the quick response actuator.

685 Levy — The smoke detection system with the standard wet standpipe heads would be OK.

Continued

700 BOARD DISCUSSION
- SD plus USP heads
- W/O SD plus Quick Response Actuator (QRA)
- Response time for Quick Response Actuator
- Relative cost of the systems

$30,000 cost of system with QRA
$60,000 cost of SD system

Difference of $30,000 or about 25 cents per s.f.
Total package cost for sprinkler system already at $3.50/s.f.

730 Degenkolb — Move to approve both the Smoke Detector System and the Standard Fire Sprinkler System.

Seconded and passed unanimously.

740 Igoe — Summarized the operation of the SD system. The scenario is valid for operating hours only. Otherwise would be normal operation. During other times the SD system will be shut off. The FD will have to sign off approval before shutting off and turning on.

During set-up and take-down operations the SD System is turned off due to the possibility of diesel trucks setting off the system.

770 Kornsand — Maintenance is the key. The sprinkler system has low maintenance problem however. The management program will minimize the maintenance problem for the SD system.

780 Igoe — Request special meeting with appropriate Board members, BBI and FD prior to the 4/19/78 meeting for the following items.

1. Kitchen Exhaust Item
   Messrs. GLndler and Cammisa will represent the Board.
   BBI and FD to be represented.
   Mr. Levy to coordinate.

2. Seismic Risk Item
   Messrs Degenkolb and Rockwell will represent the Board.
   BBI and FD to be represented.
   Mr. Levy to coordinate.
   Structural Engineer to discuss Lobby seismic frame and glass wall and the overall seismic design.

855 Igoe — Summarized the presentation to the Board on 4/19/7. Essentially will present the Fire Management Program in a summary type of format. Will cover the voice initiated egress system; the kitchen exhaust system; the seismic risk item; and the structural system for the Lobby. The last item will be the administrative item concerning the EIR which

Continued

855 Igoe Con't — will be certified by 4/19/78. The findings are to be evaluated and explored by the Board. The Board has discretionary review powers.

870 Levy — The Site Permit is scheduled for filing in May. The Board will have to ratify all decisions made to date at the 4/19 meeting. The applicant should make a summary of all approvals to date.

Board discussion on advancing the time of the next meeting, however it was decided to keep the 7:00 PM time.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM.

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

MC/ay

cc: City Librarian
SFFD, Chief Graham
Board of Examiners
John Igoe
Rolf Jensen & Associates, Inc.
HOK

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

March 1, 1978

ATTENDANCE SHEET

Name	Affiliation
John Igoe	CAO Office
Terril Richert	HOK
Norm Kornsand	Rolf Jensen & Associates, Inc.
David Barreres	"
J. E. LaMarre	Turner Construction
Hideo Akagi	Hayakawa Associates

SF
Pos 35
.2
6/5/78

SF Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
June 5, 1978

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Gendler (Chairman), Camissa, Degenkolb, Rockwell, Whittaker

Secretary: Mr. Levy, Superintendent, BBI
BBI: Mr. Register, Civil Engineer, BBI
Fire Dept: Chief Graham

JUN 23 1978

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
SF PUBLIC LIBRARY

TAPE 105
Side 2

000 Meeting called to order at 7:09 p.m.

005 The Agenda was adopted unanimously.

010 Gendler Minutes, April 19 meeting. The attendance roster should be corrected to show Robert E. Stauder as the HOK representative. With this correction, minutes of the April 19 meeting were M/S/P unanimously.

020 Levy The Conflict of Interest Code was passed by the Board of Supervisors. Appropriate forms will be sent to the members in the near future, to be returned in sealed envelopes.

OLD BUSINESS

76-20 PROCEDURE FOR CODE CHANGE FOR PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE IN EXCESS OF 1000 PERSONS (Continuance from April 19, 1978 meeting)

035 Igoe Members were referred to the revised "Board of Examiners Yerba Buena Convention Center Environmental Resolution" dated June 5, 1978. Mr. Igoe reviewed corrections made by Mr. Levy, Mr. Kenealy and himself to clarify the wording, delete items already covered in the State Guidelines, and reflect the applicability of the California Environmental Quality Act.

075 Gendler For the record, it was noted that the code change procedure should be considered by the Board at a meeting in the near future.

154 Rockwell Following discussion, it was M/S/P unanimously that the revised Environmental Resolution of June 5, 1978 be adopted as presented.

167 Igoe Referring to the Fire Management Plan approved at the previous meeting, a memo from Rolf Jensen & Associates was presented for the members' consideration. The memo

Continued

outlined certain changes to pages 8 and 20 of the Plan as proposed by Chief Condon. These modifications would: a) specify materials to meet requirements of the California Department of Consumer Affairs; and b) give the Fire Department authority over appointment of the YBCC Fire Marshal.

176 Degenkolb — Moved that the revisions noted in the Rolf Jensen memorandum dated June 5, 1978 be adopted.

Motion S/P unanimously.

180 Igoe — Items next presented for the Board's consideration and action were: 1) The Approval Resolution of June 5, 1978; 2) Board of Supervisors Resolution 401-78; and 3) The Chief Administrative Officer's letter of commitment to responsibilities outlined in Resolution 401-78.

230 Levy — Suggested that the Board proceed by first considering the sufficiency of the Resolution and the letter in satisfying its concerns.

Board discussion as to assurance of implementation.

300 Degenkolb — Moved that the Board of Supervisors Resolution 401-78 and the letter from Mr. Boas be accepted as sufficient assurance that the Fire Management Plan will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of this body.

Motion S/P unanimously.

310 Whittaker — Moved that the Approval Resolution and Appendix I (Status Report) be adopted.

Motion S/P unanimously.

76-21 — LESTER E. ROBB, PENWALT CORPORATION: PRODUCT APPROVAL OF KYNAR 500 IN LIEU OF ANODIZED COATING FOR EXTERIOR AND INTERIOR USE (Continuance from August 16, 1976 meeting)

335 Levy — This item was brought forward from an earlier hearing at which some concerns were raised as to toxicity hazards to firemen involved in a structural blaze. Investigations have been made and the applicant is now asking general approval for mainly exterior use on spandrel beams, with interior use limited to the sill and mullion. The product does not meet our Code, so the question is

Continued

whether it represents a significant variation and whether that is a problem. Toxicity test results will be presented by representatives of the organizations involved.

370 Guests
Lester Robb, Penwalt Corporation - Applicant.
John Degenkolb, designer of test method and equipment.
Lester Rosten and Robert Reinhart, Environmental Analysis Laboratory
Charles Hine, industrial toxicologist.

387
Test equipment, methods and results were described by the participants, who also responded to questions from members of the Board. In summary:

- An outdoor furnace was used to flame the Kynar coated panels, simulating a building on fire. Panels were moved in and out for a period of 15 minutes at temperatures from 600°F to 900°F. A hood was fabricated to collect the released gases, which were then led off and measured.
- Test conditions provided worst possible results; normally, vapor would be dissipated.
- Once the material has been scorched, the coating is gone --i.e., it is not a recurring process (bare metal in less than 5 minutes).
- Reference materials were distributed, illustrating test methods and tabulating results.
- Based on established levels of exposure and available test data, there would be no significant toxicity hazard occurring in this type of situation--e.g., firemen at work on a burning structure.
- Problem of settling at ground level? No--thermal convection would tend to prevent settling and it is lighter than air when hot. Further, it is very soluble and streams of water from fire hozes would render it harmless.

525 Whittaker
Moved that general approval be granted for use of Kynar 500 as an exterior finish on curtain walls and interior trim thereof (sills and mullions) to a thickness of 1 mil.

Motion S/P as follows: 4 in favor, Mr. Degenkolb abstaining.

NEW BUSINESS

78-7 ROBERT A. HAMILTON, ARCHITECT: EXISTING OFFICE BUILDING AT 693 SUTTER STREET: PENTHOUSE ADDITION - Sections

Continued

104D.1.d and 104.F, San Francisco Building Code:
Request for Variance

535 Levy — Proposed variance concerns construction of a penthouse of 690 sq. ft. The Code provides that if there is a vertical extension the structure as a whole shall comply with the retroactive seismic requirements. Also, the area apparently exceeds 20% of the total roof area and as such would have to be defined as an additional story rather than a penthouse. It was on this interpretation of the Code that his denial of the variance was based. He pointed out the limitation of the Board of Examiners' powers under a variance: that its actions cannot result in a condition less safe than the provisions of the Code. Finally, in view of the possible applicability of retroactive high-rise provisions should the vertical extension be made, he cautioned the members to limit any possible variance strictly to the seismic section.

587 Hamilton — He believes that Section 3600 also applies; it states that you can build a penthouse on a Class I or II building of 1500 sq. ft. or 20% whichever is less. The penthouse they propose is 20%. The additional 200 sq. ft. in dispute is an existing structure housing the elevator and stairs. There are no structural drawings available for this 1922 building so they must do a detailed analysis before proceeding. It has a steel frame, concrete encased, with steel joists and concrete floors. They do not intend to strengthen the first 3 floors--that is the variance they are asking.

600 Levy — Quoted from Section 3601D: "When the aggregate area of all penthouses and other roof structures exceeds 20% of the roof, the roof is considered as a story." In that case, it must comply with Section 104.F.

615 Rockwell — Feels that the request should be considered in the broad context of environmental impact. This addition represents an upgrading of the building and would have a minor effect on load. Perhaps other improvements could be made to improve overall safety.

670 Degenkolb — Expresses concern over exceeding 20% limitation clearly imposed by the Code:

Moved that the variance be granted, but that the 20% limit be held. Motion seconded and voted on: 3 in favor: Degenkolb, Camissa, Rockwell; 2 abstaining: Gendler, Whittaker.

Continued

760 Rockwell — Suggests a supplemental motion that the Board entertain a resubmittal for the area shown, based on an analysis of exact areas of the shafts, stairways, etc. on the roof, and including any proposals they might develop to improve the overall safety of the building.

814 Rockwell — After further discussion, it was suggested that the addition be considered another story, but because of the very small addition to the occupancy load, that the retroactive seismic provision of the Code be waived.

831 Levy — Refers to Section 204.D, and points out that to call it a story and grant such a waiver would place the Board in the position of saying that it is no less safe than if the seismic requirements were imposed. He suggested that if acceptable, the matter be held over, so that the applicant might reconsider his proposal in light of the discussion and suggest improvements to the overall safety of the building.

860 Gendler — The consensus was that the matter be tabled for consideration of a revised proposal at a subsequent meeting, and it was so ordered.

78-8 — C. NICHOLAS WATRY, P.E. SECTION 2601 SFBC, ACI 318-71 AND 1976 SUPPLEMENT THERETO: EQUATIONS 18-5 and 18-6 RELATING TO BONDED REINFORCEMENT, PRESTRESSED CONCRETE; REQUEST FOR INTERPRETATION.

870 Levy — Section 2601 of the Building Code requires adherence in part to ACI Section 318. Section 4532 of the Code is very specific (and so is the law) in that when you adopt a standard in the Code you must adopt the year of the standard. That is, you cannot adopt what ACI or some other proprietary agency might specify in the future. Section 453.2 states that ACI 318-71 shall be used. The applicant in part wishes to use the 1976 supplement to 318-71, which lessens the amount of reinforcement required in certain cases in concrete construction. In my opinion this is strictly a code change. Therefore, my position is that the applicant's interpretation should not be granted by this body. The Code is specific in that such interpretations can be allowed only if equivalence can be proven.

897 Watry — The ACI Code Committee in 1971 adopted a policy whereby sections of the Code could be updated annually to reflect current research. The UBC recognizes ACI 318 and all

Continued

of its supplements. The issue here is a specific formula that was in the 1971 Code and was deleted by the 1976 supplement. They are requesting that the 1971 formula be dropped.

978 Degenkolb — Expressed concern about fire resistance as distinct from structural strength. San Francisco tends to be extremely conservative in this respect. He would not favor acceptance of the applicant's interpretation.

1030 Watry — Would be willing to compromise and suggested that Equation (18-5) be modified, allowing 0.5 to be changed to 1, a 50% reduction of bonded reinforcement. This will keep within the intent of providing protection against progressive collapse.

1080 Rockwell — What we have to determine is: 1) whether the request is reasonable, and 2) whether the Code precludes it even if it is reasonable.

1085 Degenkolb — Further, even if this body has the authority to adopt such a change, would it be good policy to do so? Any such action might have a bearing on other questions.

1105 Levy — The procedure for adopting the 1976 ACI supplement would be through the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California for review; then it would be sent to other groups for comment; finally, it would go before the Board of Supervisors. An "interpretation" is in order only when the Code is unclear.

1150 Camissa — The issue of equivalence has not been addressed. What would you do to make it "as safe as"?

1160 Watry — That was not our intention. Request was to delete use of the formula in 1971 ACI supplement. An alternate proposal would be to use the formula in the 1978 ACI. It is not fully equivalent, but there are strong arguments in its favor.

1170 Degenkolb — Agrees that the proposed 1978 ACI changes seem reasonable. However, to act on the matter here would involve changing a safety factor provided in the present Code. That should be done by a committee of engineers.

1188 Degenkolb — Moved that the matter be deferred and sent to the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California for recommendations on using the ACI 1976 supplement

Continued

with regard to this specific issue and to the whole supplement; based on their advice, the Board will or will not seek a Code change.

Motion S/P unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

RHR:fw

cc: City Librarian
SFFD, Chief Graham

SF
P85.35
#2
1/29/79

SF Public Library

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING
January 29, 1979

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs Gendler (Chairman), Cammisa, Degenkolb, Rockwell, Whittaker, Kennedy and Cooper

SECRETARY: Robert C. Levy, Superintendent Bur. of Building Inspection
M. Choy, Deputy Superintendent, Bur. of Building Inspection

SF Fire Dept: Chief W. Graham

TAPE 106
Side 1

FEB 8 1979
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

000 Meeting alled to order at 7:05 PM by Mr. Gendler

003 Agenda adoption; Moved, second, and passed unanimously.

005 Approval of 6/5/78 Meeting Minutes; MSP unanimously

010 Levy Reappointments for Mr. Degenkolb and Mr. Cammisa had been held up. There had been some consideration beyond the Department level for budgetary reasons to do away with the Board of Examiners and the function and importance of this Board had to be justified to the Mayor's budget staff. These are the reasons for the long delay in the holding of this meeting.

ITEM 4 No. 79-1 was taken ahead of Item 3 because of Mr. Watry's absence.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 4 79-1 C2 COLOR 2000. RETENTION OF COPPER WASTE LINES ON PHOTOGRAPHIC SINK. 611 LARKIN STREET. SECTION 312.e. SFPC.

025 Levy Introduced Mr. Ken Lewis, Chief Plumbing Inspector. Request basically concerns the use of copper piping for waste and vent system in a photo lab.

The S.F. Plumbing Code forbids such usage. The Contractor had been told that this was not allowed on a previous job. Not everything that goes into the waste system may be neutralized and plumbing would be harmed.

038 Lewis The applicant proposed to use a silver recovery device which is mounted above the sink with the residual waste discharging into the sink. Copper does not hold up under chemical waste. The use of cast iron piping is preferred with galvanized iron of certain thicknesses allowed. However, copper is not even allowed for urinals.

S.Chiang, Lessee of 611 Larkin Street.

045 Chiang The area involved is only use for film masking. This is not a full scale lab. For silver recovery, the chemical effluent is placed in plastic containers and not in the sink. All that is needed is to rinse the tray with water. Only a small amount

of chemicals will go into the copper line. This procedure was explained to the inspector but has not received a favorable response on this. If such chemichals do harm the copper line the owner will be willing to take full responsibility for deterioration of it.

055 Gendler — How extensive is the copper line and the plumbing system?

Chiang — Line is about 120 feet.

061 Lewis — Venting is also a problem.

062 Chiang — A jewelry refinery company picks up the waste periodically. The sink is used primarily for washing prints, processing photo films and film masking. They do not have a hot water line at the sinks.

075 Lewis — There is nothing to prevent them from having hot water.

080 Gendler — Availability of hot water is not an issue here.

082 Levy — Are you an owner or lessee?
Mr. Chiang replied that he is the lessee who hired the plumbing contractor. Unfortunately the contractor is not here.

090 Levy — The Bureau has already told the contractor that this would not be allowed on a previous job. The lessee could elect to replace the copper pipe with suitable piping or take out sink.

095 Gendler — How far away is the vent piping?
Mr. Chiang replied that it is about 100 ft. or so away.

100 Rockwell — There is only 120 ft. in copper. It appears that the contractor is legally responsible to make it conform.

110 Chiang — Explained that he hired the plumbing contractor.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Difference in price between copper and approved type lines
*Other usage of basement area where sinks (2) are located
*Intent of Plumbing Code Sections 312.e and 612 to prevent corrosion of piping and protection of property.
*Sec. 612.D does not really state that copper piping shall not be used but refers to other section which does.

164 Kennedy — Motion that the request be denied
Second and passed unanimously.

Continued

170 Levy — Suggested that the applicant contact Mr. Lewis to work out a solution in the context of the denial.

Mr. Watry's Item 3 under Old Business was again deferred to permit him time to read the SEA recommendations which unfortunately was not given to him until this meeting.

Item 5
79-2 — CHARLES AND BRAUN: CHINESE HOSPITAL 835 JACKSON STREET; USE OF BASEMENT SLAB FOR PLUMBING LINE INSTALLATION: SECTION 409.1, SECTION 604, AND SECTION 702A., SFPC; VARIANCE REQUEST.

Applicants: Richard A. Charles; Charles & Braun
Jacob Tracht; Architect

190 Levy — The request deals with 3 variances. Suggested that the Board take and vote on each one separately.

First Variance Request
Section 409.1, SFPC, requires that sumps shall be provided with dual pumps or ejectors in case of overload or mechanical failures. Bureau Code Ruling allows 4 fixtures without a dual system but there are over 9 fixtures in this case. The plan to include 1 standby pump doesn't solve the problem.

210 Lewis — The District Plumbing Inspector has been given the plans. It is his understanding that the contractor has all these pumps blocked in and is ready to pour tomorrow.

212 Gendler — Discuss the requirements of Code Ruling No. 9 that permits commercial use of single pumps if not more than 4 fixtures, waste line of not greater than 2 inches and use for liquid waste only.

220 Tracht — Chinese Hospital was built as a clinic and converted into a hospital. Some 3 years ago a soil problem discovered on the site. The Structural Engineer then designed the foundation as a floating slab some 3 ft. thick. He had been advised by the Structural Engineer that the slab cannot be channeled but, that a limited number of holes in the slab would be permitted. These holes are not to exceed 30 inches in diameter and must not be closer than 5 ft. from structural columns. They are adding 11 sump pumps of which 1 is a standby. None of these pumps are going to serve much sewage since all waste from the toilet fixtures in the basement are run directly to an existing duplex sewage ejector. Mr. Tracht stated that the sewage ejector will be maintained in answer to Mr. Gendler's question.

260 Rockwell — Seems to be 2 issues involved. Pump for toilet rooms and pumps for basement facilities.

Continued

GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Clarification on plans of location of line for toilet room to ejector.
*Number of ejectors in kitchen area as being 8.
*Mr. Rockwell brought up the concept of redundancy if 1 ejector fails the overflow goes into next closest drain.

285 Gendler — What happens if there's a failure at the Central Supply area.?

290 Tracht — The ejectors serve 2 sinks. There is not a constant flow into the ejectors. The problem is that a 4 ft. dia. hole is required for a duplex pump and he has a verbal order from the Structural Engineer not to exceed 30 inches.

295 Kennedy — Would be desirable if a written verification can be given of the Structural Engineer's requirements on the size and location of holes in the basement slab.

298 Levy — Mr. Charles a professional mechanical engineer should be able to attest to that.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Possible sanitary problem
*Number of fixtures indicated on the plans not clear
*Status of construction:pump units set in hole and ready for grouting.
*Possible preemption of hospitals by State. City Attorney has not given opinion. Bureau is continuing plan checking of hospitals until matter is settled.
*Several locations exceeds requirements of Code Ruling #9
*Time involve to hook up standbys:1/2 hour
*Available headroom in basement area:7'-6"

340 Tracht — Duplex pump usage is to buy redundancy. Eleven pumps with 1 extra is a better situation. There will be a trained Building Engineer available to handle problems.

350 Degenkolb — Suggested 2 standby pumps for eleven instead of 1. The time required to change to standby is important:1/2 hour is doubtful.

380 Rockwell — The Code Ruling before the Board indicates that what is being requested cannot be done. How serious can the violation be is of key concern and good judgement is needed here since it is clear we have an illegal situation. For the kitchen area the failure of 1 pump would cause overflow of 1 drain which in turn would run-off into another. This seems to be a situation which may be acceptable.

Continued

395 Kennedy — This is an all or nothing situation. The Board needs something from the Structural Engineer to substantiate his criteria.

400 Rockwell — Motion to disapprove the variance request. Motion was seconded.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Discussed the drain situation in different basement areas:
Kitchen Area
Clean-up Area
Mechanical Room
Central Stair Area-Janitors closet
Utility storage area
*Sequential pick-up by floor drains.

428 Tracht — Suggest use of a high water alarm or use another standby pump. Cannot build up slab since headroom is already too tight.

DANIEL A. RICHARDI, CHINESE HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATOR

430 Richardi — The hospital is in operation from 7 AM to 7 PM. Employees involved, if there is water build-up, will certainly take appropriate action. The building engineer will be called. Accordingly there should be no fear of high water problem.

440 Gendler — 11 ejectors are all in 1 basement. If each of 11 had high water alarm, then early morning would be given to cut-off equipment.

450 Cooper — The problem is possible malfunction of the pumps. The dishwasher discharges quite a few gallons. The effluent is highly greasy and goes directly to the ejector. Worried about clogging of the units.

455 Cammisa — Asked whether or not another pump couldn't be added in the high discharge area.

460 Tracht — That's a possibility. Could check with the Structural Engineer as to placement of the extra hole.

470 Rockwell — Another pump would provide better redundancy. Would give favorable consideration to this approach.

At this point Mr. Rockwell withdrew his motion to deny.

485 Gendler — This will mitigate source of high flow. The situation is improved by having another pump close to the dishwasher plus an alarm to notify, to prevent flooding.

Continued

510 Degenkolb — Motion to approve 12 pumps with 2 acting as standbys. The location of the standbys will be in the areas of high flow. Amended by Mr. Lewis as a 1 job variance only.

525 — GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Question of condensate discharge not continuous and will drain out to big duplex pump.

540 — Motion was passed as follows:

5 Ayes=Gendler, Cammisa, Degenkolb, Rockwell and Whittaker

2 Nays= Kennedy & Cooper

560 Charles — 2nd Variance Request: Sec. 604, SFPC, "Indirect Waste Receptors." Code Ruling P72-9 requires floor sinks to be installed 1" above floor. Request is for variance to permit indirect receptor or floor sinks to be set flush with floor.

570 Cooper — Can become easily clogged if flush with floor. The floor sink is located near the indirect waste and floor drains cannot be used.

580 Levy — The request is to use floor sinks as floor drains a dual purpose. Object to this because of the clogging problem. Is it physically impossible to put in floor drains instead? Mr. Charles replied that it is not.
Mr. Levy recommended strongly to deny request.

590 Charles — The extra drains are in the equipment area only and are required for emergency situations. This is not a big item—— just for convenience.

600 Lewis — A floor drain with a funnel receptor is OK and no variance would be required for this.

605 Gendler — Applicant can choose to withdraw the variance request.

APPLICANT WITHDRAWS VARIANCE REQUEST

610 Charles — 3rd Variance Request- Sec. 702.A, SFPC requires each plumbing fixture to be vented. Requesting variance to permit sewage ejector vent to serve as vent for floor drain, floor sink when horizontal distance is within requirements of Sec. 702.B, Table 7A. This would apply to only those floor drains that connects directly to the sump.

Continued

620 Lewis — Read Sec. 409.G, SFPC as follows:
"The drainage and venting systems in connection with .....shall be installed under the same requirements as provided for in this Code for gravity systems, but as a separate system.

Read Sec. 409.J. SFPC as follows:
"The top (of sump receptacles) shall be provided with a vent pipe which shall extend separately to the roof.

630 Gendler — Can see no code violation within Table No. 7A

APPLICANT WITHDRAWS VARIANCE REQUEST

OLD BUSINESS

Item 3 78-8 — C. NICHOLAS WATRY, PE. SECTION 2601 SFBC, ACI 318-71 AND 1976 SUPPLEMENT THERETO: EQUATIONS 18-5 AND 18-6 RELATING TO BONDED REINFORCEMENT, PRESTRESSED CONCRETE-REQUEST FOR INTERPRETATION. Continued from 6/5/78

650 Watry — The 1975 S.F. Building Code adopted the '71 ACI but does not accept the supplements. He is requesting to use the 1977 ACI formula for bonded reinforcement but retain other '71 requirements. This would have saved $20,000 in a previous job. Had applied for variance on 9/21/78 to the SEA Code Committee, which Committee had recommended the City's adoption of the UBC by reference.

670 Degenkolb — Does not agree that the City should give carte blanche acceptance of the UBC. Difficulty would be greatly increased in design. The ACI Code does not include seismic load factors.

675 Watry — Desires acceptance of the ACI 77 supplement only.

680 Levy — The request would suggest a code change. The SEA Concrete Subcommittee addressed the problem and recommended that Sec. 18.9 of ACI 318-77 be incorporated into the SFB. The SEA Code Committee however did not, and instead recommended that the City adopt the UBC by reference. But that is a separate issue. We should just address the particular item at hand.

700 Chief Graham — His understanding is that the effect of the change in bonded reinforcement requirement will have no effect on fire resistance.

705 Watry — Discussed requirements of Formula 18-5, 1971 ACI- which deals with min. bonded reinforcement for 1 way slabs and beams as a function of the ultimate capacity of the rebar. This formula is usually greater than the 4% formula, Formula 18-6. The '77 ACI supplement limits the tensile stress to $6 \times \sqrt{f'_c}$ as compared to '71 ACI's $12 \times \sqrt{f'_c}$. It would seem prudent to incorporate all ACI supplements into the Building Code since these are valid and tested.

Continued

740 Degenkolb — There is no real answer. The ACI covers load factors and the supplement cover seismic factors in this particular issue. A piecemeal consideration is bothersome. The request is for a code interpretation which could lead directly to a code change.

765 Degenkolb — If we go all UBC then EQ coefficients would be doubled which makes it more conservative. The SFBC is more liberal in this instance. For the case at hand the more liberal items are taken out of the 2 codes.

780 Rockwell — We should be specific and grant the request with limitations. Cannot recommend adopting UBC or ACI in total.

795 Levy — What Mr. Watry wants needs a code change. Board would need a trade-off to grant equivalence. The equation cannot be omitted.

800 Watry — The limiting tensile stress at $6\sqrt{f'c}$ instead of $12\sqrt{f'c}$ is offered as a trade-off for dropping Formula 18-5.

830 Levy — There is a 3 year cycle of code changes. In the forthcoming code change, will consider adopting structural provisions of UBC by reference and using UBC standards in lieu of ACI Standards. This is a major code change effort and will take about 1½ years.

840 Watry — The request has little to do with seismicity. Has been a year since the original request. As a trade-off, can limit tensile stress to 1/2 of what SFBC requires. The application is for one-way slabs systems which are not part of a ductile frame.

895 Degenkolb — Motion to approve omission of ACI Formula 18-5 in the design of one way slab and beams. Formula 18-6 shall be used which requires 0.4% bonded reinforcement. The tensile stress shall be cut in half with Formula $f_t = 6\sqrt{f'c}$.

Motion was second and passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

79-3 Item 6 — ROCHLIN & BARAN & ASSOCIATES. CHINESE HOSPITAL, 835 JACKSON STREET. DOORS LEADING TO STAIR SHAFT ENCLOSURES HAVE HOLD OPEN DEVICES CONTROLLED BY PRODUCTS OF COMBUSTION DETECTORS. SECTION 4306.E, SFBC. VARIANCE REQUEST

950 Levy — Section 4306.E requires that fire-rated doors have closers with exceptions. In C & D occupancies, the doors shall be provided with POC detectors other than heat actuated hold-open devices. The idea is to prevent the use of wedges. BBI does not normally go into these buildings after occupancy, therefore, cannot control the use of wedges.

Continued

970 Graham — Agrees with Mr. Levy. Discussed an apparent inconsistency in 1975 and 1977 NFPA. The 1977 NFPA states that the doors may be held upon by automatic devices. One of the greatest threats to fire safety is the concept of open shafts with doors held open by wedges.

990 Richardi — The HEW Code which refers to NFPA 101 prohibits any kind of hold open devices. The major problem is that doors can be held continuously open by malfunctions. The Hospital wants to maintain these doors closed at all times. The hospital is fully manned 24 hours a day and is capable of handling the problem. Magnetic holders are more of a problem since careless opening of doors can keep it held open inadvertently.

1020 Levy — It's not unusual to see doors wedged open. Have seen it happen in hospitals. This creates an extremely dangerous fire situation.

1025 Richardi — Such problems do exist in corridor walls but has never known a stairway door to be propped open. This practice is strictly taboo in Hospital.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

* Location of smoke detectors in openings.
* What happens at power failure — doors close automatically.
* Control of use of wedges.
* Accidental securing with hold-open devices.
* Limitations of door swing
* Number of doors involved — 10
* Tieing into Fire Alarm System as alternative.

1125 Richardi — Doors are located in a tight situation and will engage magnetic holders in 85/88° angle which is not beyond the limit of accidental engagement.

1150 Rockwell — Except for accidental hold-open situations, there is no real good reason not to use the devices, unless it is physically impossible. No reasonable alternatives presented.

1165 Cammisa — Motion that the request for variance be denied

Motion Second and Passed Unanimously

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 PM

Robert C. Levy

cc: SFFD, Chief Graham
City Librarian
City Engineer
BID
PAD (2)
PID

MC/ma

Recorded: Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

January 26, 1979 Meeting

ATTENDEES

Item	NAME	AFFILIATION
3. 78-8	Nicholas Watry Peter Jaeger	Structural Engineer Civil Engineer
4. 79-1	Sai Chiang	Color 2000 Lessee
5. 79-2	Richard A. Charles Jacob Tracht	Mechanical Engineer Architect
6. 79-3	Daniel A. Richardi Carson Woo	Administrator, Chinese Hospit Charles & Braun

MC/ma

SF Public Library
City Librarian
SF
PBS.35
#2
2/5/79

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

February 5, 1979

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs Gendler (Chairman), Cammisa, Degenkolb, Rockwell, and Whittaker

SECRETARY: Robert C. Levy, Superintendent, BBI
M. Choy, Deputy Superintendent, BBI

FEB 21 1979
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

Fire Department: Chief W. Graham

TAPE 106
Side 2

000 Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM by Mr. Gendler

003 Agenda Adoption:

Mr. Levy reported that Item 5, File No. 78-6 has been cancelled at the request of the applicant, since the matter of the emergency power has already been resolved by their compliance with Sec. 700.13 of the SFEC.

Because of the necessity for John Igoe to introduce an additional item in connection with the Moscone Convention Center that is not on the agenda, he had agreed that his item scheduled as Item 3 could be heard last.

The agenda items were then appropriately renumbered.

In addition, because of the short interval of time between meetings, the approval of the Minutes of the 1/29/79 meeting was deferred to the next meeting.

The agenda as amended was MS&P unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 3
78-7 ROBERT A HAMILTON, AIA, EXISTING OFFICE BUILDING 693 SUTTER STREET, PENTHOUSE ADDITION. SEC. 104D.1.d AND 104.F. SFBC Variance Request continuance of 6/5/78 meeting.

022 Levy The matter was taken up at a prior hearing on 6/5/78 and was tabled by the Board in order to give the applicant an opportunity to investigate and propose additional means to increase the safety of the building as a trade-off in order for the Board to consider the variance on the basis of equivalence or better. Basically the roof structures exceed 20% of the area for vertical extensions and hence Sec. 104.F applie

035 Hamilton He has reviewed the matter and in the plans before the Board have proposed the following improvements in building safety:

*Change door swings

Continued

*added closers
*remove one illegal locked door
*added five extinquishers and exit signs
*added panic closers and hardware
*dismantling of the existing water tank on the roof.

050 Levy — There is a technical violation of the Code. The applicant has done almost all that can be done to improve the situation.

065 Hamilton — The penthouse is 690 sf which falls within the 20% requirement. The stairway and elevator structures add about 200 sf, thereby exceeding 20%.

075 Degenkolb — The sole violation would be seismic -- Sec. 104.F. The tank to be taken out will reduce the loading. What type of construction is the building?

077 Hamilton — The building is a concrete encased steel structure with pan joist floor construction. He has made a structural analysis and find that additional bracing will be required to bring it up to Code.

085 Graham — Does the building exceed the 75 feet limit? Mr. Hamilton replied that from the Sutter St. entrance the building is 70'-5" to floor of the penthouse.

090 — GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Exiting for the building
*Type of existing stairway - essentially open stairway
*Code requirements for exiting
*Stair and door arrangements at the different levels.
*Occupancy load at the penthouse - seven people

105 Degenkolb — Closing off the 1st floor would improve the situation. Hard to enforce arbitrary 20% Code requirements. If the 1st and 3rd floors are enclosed and the 5th floor partly closed anyway, the stairs would be protected to an acceptable extent.

135 Degenkolb — Motion to approve the request for variance since the building is better than average in safety provided the following conditions are met:

1. Remove the existing water tank from the roof.
2. Make smoke barriersat the 1st and 3rd floors.
3. Include all other proposed changes as indicated on the submitted plans.

The motion was S& P unanimously.

Continued

NEW BUSINESS
Item 4
79-5

YBC APPAREL CENTER, THIRD STREET. ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATES REQUEST VERIFICATION OF OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION. CODE INTERPRETATION. Sections 402.23.8, 1101.B, 3301.D, 3308.D & TABLE No. 33-A; SFBC.

140 Levy — Described the plan arrangement. The arrangement consist of 2 wing areas with a common center area which is actually a lounge area or public assembly and should be classifed as B-3. The areas on both sides are OK as F-2.

160 Graham — Agrees with Mr. Levy's assessment as to classification of the areas.

165 DeManty — Is in agreement with the F2 - B3 - F2 designations for the areas. The partitions in the F2 areas are semi-permanent and permits will be filed to make any changes in the layouts of the partitioned areas.

170 Levy — A permit is required.

175 DeManty — Walls are constructed of metal studs with removable or de-mountable gyp-board panels. The average size of the partitioned areas is about 200 s.f. These areas should be considered the same as for retail sales. The wholesale sales concept involves only displays of goods, not sales.

185 Levy — There seems to be a lack of communication as he and the applicant are in basic agreement.

190 DeManty — Since the application was put in the site has been moved to across the street. If the Board approves this request would be need to reapply?

195 Levy — He would consider it favorably unless the configuration was radically changed

198 Gendler — Is a Board vote necessary for this item since apparently the applicant needs only a verification?

200 Levy — He has no objection and there is no need for a Board vote on this.

BOARD DECISION: NO VOTE REQUIRED

Item 5
79-6

CARAVANSARY RESTAURANT, 310 SUTTER ST. EXITING & LATERAL FORCE REQUIREMENTS. HERAND DERSARKISSIAN. Variance Request. Sec. 3316.A.1 & Table 5.1, SFBC.

Continued

200 Levy — This is a 5 story Type 3 - 1 Hr. building with basement. The 4th floor is to be converted into a restaurant or B-3 occupancy. For exiting there is only an existing 36 inch stairway with winders and one fire escape. They are proposing to sprinkler the entire building and increase the lateral capacity by 66%, however this will not meet Sec. 104.F requirements. B-3 occupancy cannot be allowed in the 5 story building nor would it be allowed in the 3rd or 4th floor. The present exiting is not acceptable. The code requires 44 inch and 60 inch stairs.

215 Graham — Concurs with Mr. Levy's position. Concern with the increase in occupant load and the problem of evacuating people down the 36 inch stairs with winders. The exiting is definitely not adequate even with automatic sprinklers.

Mr. Khajak Sarkissian - Owner

220 K Sarkissian — Have engaged both architect and engineer for the job. This is a difficult building. Presently the 3rd floor is operating at full capacity and with standees creates an overload problem. The 4th floor is available for use and the 5th floor is proposed to be converted to provide additional dining space. No cooking will be done in this area as the cooking will be done elsewhere. They propose to sprinkler the entire building to provide added safety. Seating capacity is needed and is available in the 4th floor to reduce load concentration. They already have the permit for the 3rd floor but wants permission to increase occupant load to 74 -- the absolute maximum. The people are there and are entitled to be serve comfortably and safely.

Mr. D. SARKISSIAN -- DER SARKISSIAN ASSOCIATES

245 D Sarkissian — The restaurant is continually over limit and jammed with people all the time. There is urgent need to have more seating capacity. Permission to take advantage of the upper floors is needed. The lateral safety of the building can be increased. This is a steel building with fire escape egress to the street available. Because of the narrowness of the building it will not be feasible to increase the stair width. The facilities on the 4th floor is proposed to be a warming-up kitchen and not for food preparation.

GENERAL DISCUSSION on existing facilities and proposed modifications

275 Levy — From Mr. Der Sarkissian letter:
Existing Facilities:

*5 stories & basement Type III 1 hr.
*Basement -- retail storage

Continued

*Ground & 2nd Floor -- retail and small coffee bar.
*3rd floor -- Caravansary Restaurant as F2; limit 50 people
*4th floor -- vacant, but permit approved for F2 restaurant; limit 50 people
*5th floor -- Storage, dressing rooms (staff), and bookkeeping.

Proposed Variance

*3rd floor -- treat as B3; limit 74 people
*4th floor -- treat as B3; limit 74 people

285 D Sarkissian — The present capacity is 49 but often is up to 52 which is illegal. If they could get approval for the variance the limit will be 74 and they will be legal at all times.

288 Whittaker — Noted that the width of the stairs is only 36 inches. Legal width should be 44 inches.

OTTO AVVAKUMOVITS -- GFDS

290 Avvak. — The building does not meet 104.F but is one of the safer old buildings in San Francisco. Has performed a lateral analysis and can take care of code loads in the longitudinal direction. The transverse direction would require additional bracing in the form of rigid frames or cantilever column action. It would be impractical to bring it up to 104.F since the floors are presently occupied.

310 Levy — How much of code requirement could be met in the transverse direction:
Answer: About 67% at K=1.

315 Degenkolb — Discussed the type of beam-column connections as being simple connections. Moment connections could be made at the 4th floor, if the maximum moment is developed above the 2nd floor.

325 D Sarkissian — Would be desirable to have work done on floor above the restaurant. The intent would be to protect the accessibility of the building.

330 Degenkolb — If the lateral capacity is at 67% @ K=1 could come close to Code at K=.67 or K=.80.

335 AVVAK — The present lateral capacity @ K=1 is about 41%, but can bring up to 67%.

340 GENERAL DISCUSSION

*No gas appliances on new 4th floor restaurant.
*4th floor will have only holding or service ovens and no cooking loads will be introduced.

Continued

345 Whittaker — The trade-off of sprinklering against required stairway is not acceptable.

350 Levy — Reiterated that better exiting must be provided and the winders at the stairs be eliminated. The building itself is not suitable for expansion and is not suitable for the existing occupancy either. Should not make the situation worse by putting more people in it.

370 Degenkolb — The engineer could use K of .67 instead of 1 and stay within the Code. The lateral capacity could be increased to approximately 95%. By using the min. K, they could come pretty close as far as 104.F is concern. However the 3 ft. stairs and winders is of concern.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

*Delay action of sprinkler when fire starts
*Possible early warning devices -- smoke detectors sufficient
*Possibility of making alternate exit -- bldg. configuration does not permit.
*Present illegality when restaurant is overcrowded.
*Impracticability of fire escapes as a means of evacuating large groups of people in fire panic situations
*Legality of present winders -- legal for F 2 when building was built.

400 Rockwell — The situation as it exists is bad. The exiting is very poor and the winders dangerous. There doesn't seem to be a way to correct this. The seismic problem is not a consideration unless exiting is solved.

410 D. Sark. — There is no way to take care of the winders. The building is too narrow and would not be feasible economically.

415 Degenkolb — Is it possible to put legal stairs in the back and provide a tunnel to the front at the 1st floor?

420 D. Sark — It's possible but would have to sacrifice some of the 1st floor operation to do so.

425 Rockwell — Motion to disapprove variance request in the light of the present seismic information and the winder.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON MOTION

*Can be made to meet Code seismically
*Stair problems deal with both the winders and the 36 inch width
*Level above 1st floor not a mezzanine but a story with 7 ft. ceiling height.
*Consensus that proper solution has not been presented.

Motion to deny was S&P unanimously.

Continued

Item 6
79-7

444 MARKET STREET. CODE CONSULTANTS, INC. ELIMINATION OF MECHANICAL VENTILATION FOR SMOKEPROOF TOWER STAIR VESTIBULES. Variance Request. Sec. 3309.B, SFBC. SMALL ROOM RULE, NFPA 13 - 1976 INSTEAD OF NFPA 13- 1972.

480 Levy

There are 2 variance requests made.

1. Small Room Rule
2. Mechanical Ventilation system for the smoke tower.

At this time would like a statement from the Architect of Record that the items under appeal would be endorsed by the Architect if approved by the Board.

CARL A. SCHOLZ - SOM

485 Scholz

The items of appeal are by the owner not by SOM but has the support of SOM

490 Levy

that
Asked for the qualification/the variance if granted will be subject to the approval of the Architect of Record.

The applicant has chosen mechanical ventilation of the stair tower, hence all areas must be mechanically ventilated. The point of contention is the mech. vent. of the vestibule. Discussed requirements of Sec. 3309.C.4.C and Sec. 3309.C.4.D. Does not think the applicant has provided for equal safety or an engineered ventilation system.

520 Grahm

The staging operation is to be held in the vestibule area away from the exiting public. Is concern that if a number of doors are open due to fire exiting conditions positive pressure against the doors cannot be maintained.

ED SCHULZ - CODE CONSULTANTS INC

530 Schultz

They are providing greater pressure throughout. Discussed the stair pressurization scheme and the 3 floor module concept with the help of a "Stair Pressurization" diagram showing a partial section with the floor modules, fresh air flow and combustion product flow indicated.

The stair tower pressurization has 2 separate fan system, 1 upper and 1 lower with a central area relief control to prevent overpressurization.

Discussed the system in which the fresh air is taken and pumped through the HVAC ducts. The return air goes through the plenum space and is discharged out. The fan system is designed for 3 floors at a time. Pressurization is maintained in the stairs to prevent smoke migration even when 10 to 11 doors are open. System is superior to requirements of the Code.

Continued

Title 19 and current UBC has allowed pressurization of stair towers of sprinklered buildings at 0.15 inches of water without vestibules.

The difference is that instead of providing .05 inches at stairs and .05 negative at vestibules they will provide 3 times that pressure at the stairs with 0.15 inches of water column with a 2 fan system.

625 Degenkolb — The incoming air is through the ducts and outgoing air through the plenums. Are there chillers and heaters every 3 floors to take care of the HVAC?

DAN MORROW - SOM

630 Morrow — There is a fan room every 3rd floor for heating.

645 Gendler — Why is it being done this way since the Code requires the vestibule to be mechanically ventilated through separate ducts used only for this purpose.

650 Schultz — The system is a superior system with 3 times air quantity as provided by the Code system.

RICK THORNBERRY - CODE CONSULTANTS INC.

670 Thornberry — They are providing a tenable exit system equal or better than Code. The Code was written in 1973 - many advancements since. The National Building Code of Canada recommends total sprinklering in high-rise buildings with no need to pressurize stairways. Substantial testing has been done and system has been under development since 1973. UBC, BOCA and Title 19 have all recognized the merits of this system -- that the stairways be permitted to be pressurized without mechanically ventilated vestibules if the building is completely sprinklered.

Discussed full scale testing on unsprinklered building. Referred at this point to Exhibits A-2, A-3, A-20 and A-14 of the Henry Grady Fire Tests and pointed out the following:

*Fire tests are on more severe conditions
*Minimal smoke buildup in vestibule due to effective pressurization.
*Under negative pressure in vestibules there would be considerable smoke in vestibule.
*Air injection only at the bottom. There is still not a negative pressure situation with 11 doors open.

Continued

757 Thornberry — Have documentation demonstrating that most fire conditions within compartments in uncontrolled situations, unsprinklered will not exceed 0.15 inches pressurization. Most uncontrolled fire conditions will not exceed .05 to 0.10 inches. Therefore their system can even cope with uncontrolled fire conditions.

767 Levy — The Code says the following:
1. Alternative methods must be obviously equal or better.
2. The definition of reasonable levels of safety is immaterial in this case. What needs to be provided is not less than 1 air change per minute and exhaust 100% of the supply plus leakage.
3. Positive pressure to be maintained in the stair shaft.

A smoke dampering system per Sec. 5130.I can be used as an alternate system.

Equivalence of the proposed system has not been shown.

793 Thornberry — Discussed locations of the supply fans -- 1 at the basement level and 1 at the top.

Under the Code system if there is leakage the smoke is drawn in. The vestibules are then not smoke free. Emphasized that their system has been proven and codified for 6 years -- since 1973 and that the test data is for not-sprinklered conditions. Their system has active smoke control and superior pressurization.

848 Degenkolb — What happens if power shuts down.

850 Thornberry — If it happens they would still have active smoke control assuming the stair fans operate. This is a comparative thing, but would end up in better shape than the Code system under the same conditions.

860 Degenkolb — Because of the lesser number of fans the size of the two fans are greatly increased and more apt to give trouble. In a quake situation there would be simultaneous evacuation and the system must handle more opened doors than the Code dictates.

890 Levy — This must be treated as a single job variance since this will be setting a precedence. Most buildings use exhaust and supply mode during fire situation

910 — GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Comparative effect of power failure on both systems
*Minor pressure differential in S.F because of small temperature differences

Continued

*Differences in pressures between vestibule and stairs.
*All systems on standby emergency power.
*What happens in EQ situation when fans won't work.

975 Gendler — The system apparently works but don't see how the system with single fans is better than dual fan system per Code.

985 Schultz — Under the worse conditions the systems are equal. Under all other conditions, their system is better.

998 Gendler — The building is 36 stories and air is being brought in only at the top and bottom instead of at each level. There are no ducts in the system except in the vestibules.

1008 Schultz — Only 3 floors are being served.

1010 Rockwell — The case has been cogently argued. Because no-one is in conscious ignorance or disparate authority the Board has no recourse but to rely on other authorities. The evidence presented can't be dismissed.

1075 Whittaker — What is the emergency? Perhaps the Board needs more background and time to consider.

ROBERT E. COY - OWNER

1080 Coy — Building is under construction and is already up 28 stories. The concrete is halfway up. Will need the Board decision tonight. Would go along with any decision.

1110 Rockwell — Motion to disapprove variance on the basis that there is insufficient time to properly evaluate the proposal.

A discussion of whether or not applicant would wish for another Board meeting with more time to consider evidence and arguments ensued but the owner's final decision was to have the Board decision right away.

Motion was carried as follows:

Ayes: Whittaker, Rockwell, Degenkolb — Nays: Cammisa — Abstain: Gendler

1160 Levy — The second variance request deals with the small room rule in which requirements of NFPA 13 - 1976 are requested to be followed instead of NFPA 13-1972. This deals with the clearance of spacing for automatic sprinkler head installations.

1165 Whittaker — Motion that the variance be granted.

Motion was S&P unanimously.

Continued

OLD BUSINESS

Item 7 76-20 — YBC PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BELOW GRADE: JOHN IGOE, PROJECT COORDINATOR: SPECIAL REQUEST FOR STAIR DESIGN CHANGE FROM APPROVED GUIDELINES, AND CLARIFICATION OF FIRE RATING REQUIREMENTS OF TEMPORARY WALL ASSEMBLIES.

1175 Levy — Mr. Igoe has previously canvassed the Board members on the acceptability of the stairway design change from 7 inch rise, 11 inch tread to 7 1/2" rise, 10" tread. The Board Guidelines had recommended the 7 inch rise, 11 inch tread configuration.

1178 Degenkolb — Motion to ratified this.

Motion was S&P unanimously.

1180 Levy — The second request has to do with the portable or movable wall partitions dividing the main hall. The Code does not require a 1-hr rating, only requires that it be incombustible. The tested 1-hr assembly is only good for 120 sf. The walls in this case are up to 37 ft high and 280 ft long. A small panel tested for 1-hr will be OK but no one knows what real rating such a large wall might have.

1198 Graham — Would prefer that the wall be 1-hr rated. Even for a large wall - would be worth more than incombustible.

1210 Igoe — Review history of the request. Originally the wall was acceptable as being incombustible. In November 77 meeting the Board acted to rescind this because of the vinyl wall covering on the wall. Initially in a survey of manufacturers, 13 walls were found and only 1 with a fire-rating -- Won-door Co. Later another manufacturer was found to have a 1-hr wall - Modernfold.

The bids were based on the walls as non-combustible. If 1 hr is required then they must rebid, redesign and "re-spec." Only 2 bidders will be available for bidding on the 1 hr wall assembly.

1240 Richert — Discuss exiting of facility with emphasis on the handicap egress problem.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Voice initiated evacuation.
*Motorization of the wall assemblies - 1 of the 2 1-hr wall manufacturers.
*Type of wall covering - carpet type with 1C requirement.

BOB MORRY - WON DOORS, INC.

1310 Morry — Their wall assembly is 1 hr rated and fully automatic. The panels are hinged. The system can be closed from remote stations with manual overrides. In contrast Modernfold is

Continued

not really a door but a series of manually assembled panels.

Their bid figures on the cost of all doors for the project is $850,000 as compared with low bid of $1,300,000. This will save the City about $500,000. Their fire doors are all UL approved with a baked enamel finish. The final finish is independent. UL will certify unlimited height and length.

1400 Levy — The finish must meet 1-C requirements.

1405 Richert — The carpet finish specified meets 1-C requirements.

1410 Gendler — Sec. 1705.A.5 of the SFBC does not require 1-hr rating, only incombustible.

1420 Levy — A 1-hr rating is not required but the Board has the prerogative to add what is deemed necessary for safety.

1435 Rockwell — The non-combustible wall should be allowed and the Architect should get the best available. The Board should not back new position in excess of Code.

Motion that incombustible requirement be sufficient for the portable or movable walls.

1460 Degenkolb — Expressed concern on the large expanse of carpeting finish on the panels and how the wall assembly is put together. The flame spread and smoke are problem areas.

1480 Levy — The flame spread and surfacing are independent issues if 1-C finish is used since 1-C is acceptable by the Code. Discussed that under panic conditions, if doors are open, stays open. The Code does not recognize horizontal exiting.

Motion was S&P unanimously.

1520 Degenkolb — Motion that the Board express/concern that suitable wall covering is obtained and that the construction of the assembly be such that it does not lose parts during a fire due to buckling.

Motion was S&P unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 PM.

Recorded:

Robert C. Levy, Secretary

cc: SFFD Chief W. Graham
City Libarian
City Engineer
PAD 2
BID

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MEETING OF FEBRUARY 5, 1979

ATTENDEES

	NAME	AFFILICATION
ITEM 3 78-7 R. Hamilton	Robert L. Hamilton	Robert L. Hamilton AIA
ITEM 4 78-6 G. Gimsonson	CANCELLED	
ITEM 5 79-5 Apparel Center	Jack Anderson Ernest DeManty Thomas Lee	Architects Associated " A
ITEM 6 79-6 Caravansary	Khajak Sarkissian Setrak Injeyan Otto Avvakumovits H. Der Sarkissian	Owner Owner GFDS Engineer Der Sarkissian Associates
ITEM 7 79-7 444 Market	Ed Schultz Carl A. Scholz Dan Morrow Rick Thornberry Robert E. Coy	Code Consultants Inc. SOM SOM CCI DCF Owner
ITEM 8 76-20 YBC	John Igoe Terri Richert	Project Coordinator HOK

SF
P85.35
#2
3/19/79

SF Public Library

DOCS

APR 2 1979

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

March 19, 1979

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs Gendler (Chairperson), Rockwell, Whittaker, Cammisa and Degenkolb.

SECRETARY: Robert C. Levy, Superintendent BBI
M. Choy, Deputy Superintendent BBI

Fire Department: Chief William Graham

TAPE 107
Side 1

000 Meeting called to order at 7:53 PM by Mr. Gendler.

003 Agenda M S and adopted unanimously

005 Minutes of 1/29/79 Meeting M S & P unanimously
Minutes of 2/5/79 Meeting M S & P unanimously

NEW BUSINESS

Item 4 NO. 79-8. DRYVIT SYSTEM, EXTERIOR WALL SURFACING FOR USE ON TYPE 1 THROUGH TYPE 4 CONSTRUCTION: SECTIONS 1801, 1901, 2001 & 2101, S.F. BUILDING CODE. Variance Request.

010 Levy Discussed the basic makeup of the system which has a polystyrene core. Wall surfacing is not intended to be a substitute for fire rating but utilized for insulation and aesthetics.

The City approval has approved its use on Type 5 construction with a 1" limitation on thickness. The ICBO approval limits the thickness to 4" and it is believed that the applicant desires the approval up to 4" thickness for Type 1 through Type 4 construction.

The data submitted indicates FS=10, SD=450 so there appears to be only a little fuel contribution involved. Sec. 1705.B, SFBC specifies that combustible material applied may not exceed 3/4". Table 17D, SFBC places a 30% coverage limitation on Class I material. Therefore the material is illegal per Code on 2 counts:

1. Greater than 3/4" thick

2. Greater than 30% coverage

Continued

040 Levy — The modify test by Williams only defines what happens during the fire test but does not draw any conclusions. The test established that the material melts in the flame area. There is concern about what happens to the drippings and the extent of this hazard. The Factory Mutual test shows flaming however the smoke generation is not much concern since we're dealing with the outside of the building. A "hot fire" can travel and such a fire from across the street can induce dangerous flammable conditions in such installation.

070 Graham — Agreed with Mr. Levy's comments. He was witness to the William's Test and noted extensive melt down and crystallization of the material where heat was applied. Chief Graham then burned a sample of the polystyrene core and much black smoke and flaming ensued.

RANDY RUSHING: DRYVIT SYSTEM INC.

80 Rushing — Stated that the company desires the approval of their system for exterior wall surfacing for types 1 through 4 construction with thickness up to 4" thick. Described the welded construction of the system and details of application. The advantages were stated as being energy conserving, weight savings, cost reduction, and non-cracking of surface.

Describe various large jobs in California and Nevada.

110 Rushing — Narrated slide presentation showing various jobs around the country which used the system.

DONALD BELLES: FIRE PROTECTION ENGINEER

143 Belles — Agreed that foam plastics is always of concern in Fire Safety situations. Their testing shows FS=10, SD=0 which indicates that E-84 testing is inappropriate for foam plastics since there is a wide discrepancy of results under the same conditions. The FM Corner Test which was tested using a 750 pound wood crib established 1000°F for 5 minutes is overly severe. However FM is satisfied on the basis of the test.

Discussed the William's Test with the E 108 apparatus. Units up to 8" thick were tested and they are asking only for 4". They have obtained approvals from 3 model codes. The fuel load of Dryvit material, 4" thick contributes only 6,000 BTU/sf as opposed to gyp board, fire retardant wood stud system of 7500 BTU.

Continued

CHARLES W. KAPLAN: EMKAY DEVELOPMENT

275 Kaplan — Emkay Development Co. is currently working on a 12 story Hi-Rise housing project in Chinatown located on the SW corner of Stockton and Sacramento. It is a HUD sponsor Redevelopment project and they have a serious economy problem which is dependent on the Board's ruling on the Dryvit system.

317 Levy — Does not agree with Mr. Belles that the Tunnel Test is not a good test. It is the best test available and is appropriate. The example of the fire-treated wood is a type of construction only allowed inside the building and is not appropriate as a comparison.

The issues of the code violations of thickness of material and limitations of coverage has not been addressed by the applicant.

345 Rockwell — How does the material compare with wood with respect to fuel contribution?

350 Levy — The Code permits wood but not as a Class 1 finish. Wood is Class 3 and is permitted only 15% coverage per Table 17D.

JOHN WATT, PLASTER BUREAU

375 Watt — Asked for Board consideration of approval of the Dryvit System on behalf of the plastering industry.

380 Belles — Board has the choice of making a literal interpretation of the Code or examine the wealth of information presented.

*Submittal based on full scale assembly test
*Flame did not travel up the polystyrene
*A reasonable level of safety has been established.
*A slotted assembly in the flame test demonstrated that the foam does not burn under those conditions.

395 Cammisa — Expressed surprise that the slotted areas exposing the foam did not burn since Chief Graham's demonstration showed otherwise.

396 Belles — The material cannot burn inside the protected coating.

400 Levy — The Berkeley Test is just a qualitative test. The Factory test shows that the material does burn. The E-84 test has been used for many years and is a proven quantitative test.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

*SFBC requirement for thickness of 3/4" which is not in the UBC.
*SFBC requirements for incombustibility on the outside

*SFBC requirements for Class 1, 2 and 3.
*Differences in ratings for the coating and insulation board.

440 Degenkolb — Is concerned with the smoke potential on the outside of the building. San Francisco does not have the same conditions as other locales with buildings packed close together.

450 Rockwell — The material is clearly against the Code. The applicant must determine equivalence.

470 Gendler — The protection is based on reliance on the outside coating which is 1/16" thick. What is the makeup of the outside coating?

485 Belles — The outside coating is made with polymers with 80% sand. It is a thin lamina finish with a flame spread of zero.

500 Degenkolb — Is concern with High-Rise fires. Temperatures on H-R fires are much higher than what was used in the applicant's test.

510 Belles — Cannot use the E 119 test. The material is used on the outside of the building and their test has tried to duplicate the exterior face of the building.

512 Degenkolb — The E 119 is a basic requirement test and should be used.

525 Zsiba — The material has the ability to protect fire spread in exterior wall and prevent fire from going from point A to point B.

527 Levy — How is temperature criteria for the test developed?

528 Belles — The temperature criteria is derived from Japanese and European sources.

560 Rushing — There will be massive insulation shield on the outside face. The polystyrene material is 93% air with a cementitious coating on the outside and constitutes a non-cracking surface that does not spread flame.

605 Kaplan — Described location and configuration of the Chinatown HUD project and emphasized the exterior walls distance from the adjacent properties.

625 Rockwell — If Dryvit is used, how can the percentage coverage be justified if hazard can be determined to be less than wood and 15% coverage is allowed for wood?

640 Levy — Not sure of the 24,000 BTU output as indicated in the data.

Continued

650 Rockwell — Must approach along that line, it is up to the applicant to develop the data.

660 Degenkolb — The material is not obviously equal. The basic requirement is a 2 hr. wall. Motion to deny the request for a general approval.

The motion was not seconded

680 Rushing — They are interested in getting a general approval. A one-job approval is also needed for the HUD project in Chinatown.

688 Rockwell — The applicant must come back to the Board with 2 applications:

1. A special approval request for a specific building with details, setbacks and wall configurations and details defined.

2. General Approval request with documentation to substantiate equivalence.

700 Levy — The applicant should, in coming back to the Board, modify his general request for an approval based on the substantiation data presented.

728 Degenkolb — We are dealing with basically 4-hr walls. The intent is to place this material on an entire wall. This type of construction will cause problems in congested areas of San Francisco.

740 Gendler — The item is tabled to allow the applicant sufficient time to modify his request in the light of substantiation and data to be presented to the Board. At the same time a one-job approval for the use of Dryvit may be requested for the Chinatown Housing Project in the event a general approval cannot be approved or if such approval conditions prove to be inappropriate.

The next meeting of the Board was tentatively set for the evening of April 9, 1979.

ITEM 5 — NO. 79-9 ROLF JENSEN & ASSOCIATES: NEIMAN MARCUS BUILDING, 199 GEARY STREET: FIRE PROTECTION PROGRAM FOR COMMON LOADING DOCK WITH LIBERTY HOUSE BUILDING: SECTIONS 1705.D.2 1803.B.1 & 1807, S.F. BUILDING CODE; Variance Request.

780 Levy — There was an apparent error in the original plan check of the Liberty House as regards the street width requirement for the dock area access. The applicant has proposed a joint use of an expanded use of the dock area for both Neiman Marcus and Liberty House with easement to be worked out for joint usage since Neiman Marcus cannot get in without going through Liberty House area.

The actual alley width is 33'-9" with the min width of the unprotected street equal to 40'. The 40' unprotected opening at the Liberty House entry to the dock area needs a 3-hr. door. There doesn't seem to be a better way to provide the fire protection except coming in from another street. The applicant has apparently done all that can be done to improve the fire safety situation.

870 Graham — In general agreement with Mr. Levy.

880 — The EIR has stipulated that no truck entry will be permitted from the fwo fronting streets, Geary and Stockton Streets. Desribed the configuration line of a 4 hr. separation between Niman Marcus and its new dock area contiguous with the existing Liberty House dock area. A deluge sprinkler system is proposed for the NM dock area with 0.19 density with an extra line of sprinklers at the entry line. It is believed that the LH dock area has ordinary Type 2 Hazard Sprinkler protection. There will be a new 4-hr. wall line for both buildings.

990 Levy — Everything has been done that can be done. Is concern with fire protection for the entry from Security Pacific Place. This area is deficient and theoretically requires a 3 hr. door.

1000 Gendler — Motion that both staging areas be provided with a deluge sprinkler system with the 4 hr. separation from the two buildings, along with an extra line of sprinklers at entry from Security Pacific Place.

1040 Kornsand — The applicant agrees with this proposal.

1050 — The motion was S & P unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 11 PM.

Recorded by:

Robert C. Levy, Secretary

cc: SFFD Chief Graham
City Librarian
City Engineer
PAD (2)
BID

MC/ma

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MEETING OF MARCH 19, 1979

ATTENDEES

		NAME	AFFILIATION
79-8	DRYVIT		
	Ray Lynch		Dryvit System Inc.
	Randy Rushing		Dryvit System Inc.
	Donald Belles		Fire Protection Engr.
	Charles W. Kaplan		Emkay Development
	Ben Bledsor		Westech Matts Corp.
	Al J. Zsiba		Amming Johnson Contrs.
	Wayne R. Degoey		Dryvit System Inc.
	John Watt		Plaster Bureau of S.F.
79-9	Neiman Marcus		
	Norman Kornsand		Rolf Jensen & Assoc Inc.
	Phillip Pitts		Neiman-Marcus

SF-Public Library
F
85.35
2
16-79

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

MINUTES OF MEETING

April 16, 1979

APR 27 1979
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs Gendler (Chairman), Cammisa, Degenkolb, Cooper, Rockwell & Kennedy

SECRETARY: Robert C. Levy, Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection.

M. Choy, Deputy Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection.

SFFD: Capt. McKlem .

TAPE 107
Side 2

004 Meeting called to order at 7:10 PM by Mr. Gendler

008 Agenda Adoption: Typo error on Item 6; correct Section 2313.B to Section 2312.B. The agenda as corrected was M S & P unanimously.

012 Approval of 3/19/79 meeting Minutes; MSP unanimously.

Because of late arrival of the Fire Department representative, Item 5 was taken out of turn as the first item.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 5 NO. 79-11 Orme and Grabstein: 2817½-22ND St; Section 313 SFPC; Request for Variance, Board of Plumbing Examiners.

Levy Question of existing buildings and drainage through a common sewer. Sec. 313, SFPC applies. Drainage system of each new building or new work installed in existing bldg. shall be separate and independent of the drainage system of building and every building shall have an independent connection. In this case - one lot, 2 bldgs. in front and 1 in rear. Bldg. in back had extensive plumbing work done. Received complaint that all plumbing was hooked into a common sewer. We require, per Sec. 313; disconnect and place system into separate sewer.

028 Lewis Inspector who handled case originally has been retired. The present inspector Mr. Aicardi not presently here. Permit issued for work done. In Feb. 78, OK was given for work in kitchen only. In Feb. 78 there was request to change gas line which has not been done and the inspector OK'd the rough-in water for the work in the existing building. 5/4/78 letter received from property

Continued.

next door demanding that the sewer connecting of this property be removed. The inspector then informed the owner of 2817 22nd St that he would have to connect to sewer independently. Job has not been finished, gas not passed and job is held in abeyance.

042 Lewis — Referred to 1/3/79 letter sent to Mr. Aicardi after owner was notified to disconnect.

DISCUSSION OF THE BUILDINGS INVOLVED

* Separate ownership-but common ownership at one time
* 3 buildings; 2 along street line and 1 in rear which is in question.
* Easement problem

052 Grabstein — Represents the owner of the rear cottage property and also one of the street front properties. The inspector had OK'd the roughing in of the open sewer connection. The work that the contractor was contracted to do was done under permit approved by the inspector and the plumbing contractor has so stated in writing.

Described the arrangement of the three buildings. No new addition systems were added to the rear cottage-- but to place the existing facilities into the terra cotta sewer. Cottage had been always connected to the system involving the other buildings.

DISCUSSION

* The expense of putting in a new sewer line was discussed.
* Easement problem
* All 3 houses on same sewer connection

85 Levy — If 2 owned by O'Connor and combination of 2 bldgs. did not exceed 3000 sf-could be done. Since the other building is also on the sewer, this would require a variance to the Code. If other owner has not been notified and Board makes a decision in favor of Mr. O'Connor the other party should then be given an opportunity of a rehearing. If decision against Mr. O'Connor, then there would be no need for a rehearing.

95 Grabstein — Other party was before the BPA but withdrew the matter before that Board. Can assume that they are aware of the appeal to this Board of Examiners.

100 Rockwell — Feels that motion shouldn't be tabled. Agrees with Mr. Levy's suggestion and Board should then take action accordingly.

105 Cooper — Ask the Board to table the item temporarily and wait for Mr. Aicardi to show up and give his input on the facts of the case.

Continued.

108 Lewis — Reads letter dated 1/3/79 from Miss Casanavi, the complainant, to Mr. Aicardi.

"Owners of 2821-27 - 22nd St, filed a complaint at the BPA regarding Permit Appeal No. 8435 regarding Permit No. 443586, Application No. 7805544 filed by O'Connor. Willing to drop complaint if plumbing work is addressed. No independent sewer connection. In violation of SFPC. No plumbing plans include provisions for this independent sewer connection. Would drop BPA action if BBI could assure them in writing if Permit #443586 in no way authorizes plumbing work. Needs assurance that before final work is approved that proper approved connection to the sewer will be completed."

Sounds like they don't know that this meeting is going on since obviously they would be here if they did.

125 Levy — Under impression that both parties had been notified, but he is not sure. Up to the Board to make an interpretation and decision on Sec. 313, SFPC. The 3 exceptions are not met by Mr. O'Connor.

135 Rockwell — Another interpretation is accessible. Have 2 buildings on a common lot that are connected to a common sewer. There is an objection of having an adjoining building under a different owner hooked on to the same sewer. Not abundantly clear that exception 2 cannot be applied here. The pre-existing exception is not subject to remedy, being the front line building.

148 Levy — Does not feel that Exception 2 applies here. Would apply only if the other front line building is on a separate lot or not hooked on.

150 Gendler — Any problem with fixture count?
Mr. Lewis replied that there would be none.

158 Kennedy — Other party who is tied in to the common sewer, apparently opposed to adding more fixtures or doing more plumbing work?
Answer was no - they just want them off of the sewer line.

160 Lewis — Cannot force the owner of the front building to disconnect from the sewer.

163 Levy — Has checked with Mr. Choy and been informed that both parties had been notified.

166 Cooper — Urge Board to wait 5/10 minutes for Mr. Aicardi to show-up Confident that he will show up.

Item was tabled temporarily until Plumbing Inspector Aicardi's arrival in order for the Board to hear his presentation and additional background information.

Continued

Item 8 — No. 79-14 Rolf Jensen & Assoc., Calvary Presbyterian Church; Mechanical Smoke Exhaust System; Sections 5130.1.3 & 5130.1.4 San Francisco Building Code; Request for Variance

175 Levy — The item involves fire dampers for the Calvary Presbyterian Church. A system as part of an engineered system utilizing fire dampers in lieu of smoke dampers is limited to office buildings and H buildings not exceeding 75' in height.

190 McKlem — Explained occupancy differences between F-2 and H where H concerns occupancy on a 24 hr. basis. A church occupancy is even more limited than F-2.

200 Kornsand — Smoke dampers are required for 3 story buildings and higher. They have a 3 story building and would prefer an active smoke removal system rather than a smoke damper system.

220 Rockwell — If variance is granted for this building, this would not necessarily apply to other buildings.

225 Levy — Is concerned about setting a precedence even though this is a 1-job variance.

228 Kornsand — The smoke damper panel board would not be used in an emergency anyway. The fireman would just bypass that and go in and fight the fire in the case of a 3 story building.

240 McKlem — Agreed with that concept.

245 Degenkolb — Motion that the variance be granted.

The motion was S & P unanimously.

Item 9 — No. 79-15 Rolf Jensen & Associates: Fire Resistance for Interior Stairways; Section 3316.1.E, SFBC, Request for Interpretation.

250 Levy — An interpretation is requested on Sec. 3316.1.E on what is meant by interior stairways being of combustible 2-hr. fire-resistive construction.

DISCUSSION

* Hard to find 2-hr. stairway
* Metal stairways all over town would not meet a 2-hr requirement.

275 Kornsand — Section 3316.1.E applies only to Group B. Division 2 occupancies. Believes the Code is talking about stairs that are not in a fire-rated enclosure. The code is referring to open stairs - not enclosed stairs.

Continued

280 Levy — Is happy to go along with Mr. Kornsand's interpretation

285 Gendler — Motion to accept Mr. Kornsand's interpretation as basis for interpreting Sec. 3316.1.E.

Motion was S & P unanimously.

RETURN TO ITEM 5 No. 79-11

295 Aicardi — Had sent to Mr. O'Connor notice of violation of the Plumbing Code and advised him to run separate line to the street connection. Within the bungalow, no new fixtures were added, just a revamping of the existing system. The neighbor apparently concerned about an overload effect and possible stoppages.

310 Gendler — They are putting back in the same fixtures. The 3 buildings were on the same sewer and this situation hasn't changed.

315 Kennedy — Asked Mr. Aicardi if he concurs with the request or if he sees any problems with it.

318 Aicardi — Doesn't see any great problem - has worked all these years with the same amount of pressure.

315 Kennedy — Motion to allow the variance in favor of Mr. O'Connor as a 1-job variance.

Motion was S & P unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 3 — NO 79-8 DRYVIT SYSTEM, EXTERIOR WALL SURFACING FOR USE ON TYPE 1 THROUGH TYPE 4 CONSTRUCTION: SECTIONS 1801, 1901, 2001, 2101, SFBC, VARIANCE REQUEST CONTINUED FROM 3/19/79

330 Levy — Summarized the applicants submittal.
Mr. Belle's letter discussed comparative BTU output of 3/4" wood at 18,000 BTU and 4" Dryvit at 6000 BTU. Generally wood has a flame spread of around 100 and is considered Class 4 material. Table 17D allows no combustible material on exterior wall until distance 20-30 feet building line to opposite property line, with 5% to 10% of wall permitted in Class 4 material.

The size of individual panels is also limited. The 3 to 1 ratio based on BTU output may not be valid. Feels that the case has not been proven and recommends denial.

Continued

360 McKlem — Sample will burn, melt and generate gas but with the backing there is a resistance to flaming and melting. The material does not present too much of a problem as applied on the exterior.

365 Lynch — The material meets the definition of incombustible, since it has been tested and has been proven not to ignite or actively support combustion in a surrounding temperature of 1200°F during an exposure of 5 minutes.

380 Levy — Referred to the Factory Mutual Test pictures which show flames. Applicant must run test on each of the components to prove his point. A metal skin could be placed on wood assembly and it will still be combustible.

420 Lynch — The flaming shown on the FM photos was due to burning of sealant compound which is not part of their assembly. They will use standard caulking joints.

435 Levy — The system must include the joints.

450 Lynch — Reiterated that they have satisfied the definition of incombustibility. Their material does not ignite or support combustion and is therefore an incombustible material as defined in Sec. 402.9.14 of the SFBC.

470 Rockwell — The applicant should address another line of argument.

472 Lynch — Per Table 42-A their material is in Category 1-A based on FS and SD as tested. Material should be subject to Table 17D for Type 1 finish 10-20 ft. distance with a multiple of 3 base on BTU comparison with wood.

500 Levy — Would agree with Mr. Lynch if material is 3/4" thick and can be considered as Class 1. The problem is that we're talking about 4" polystyrene which is not related to Class 1 material.

550 McKlem — No real problem in fire-fighting for material applied to the exterior. Would require a very hot fire to get the material going-however a proper sealant is needed.

570 Degenkolb — If used in light wells as an exterior application, would be a problem.

Motion that the variance be denied.

590 Rockwell — Discussed wood analogy. Wood has 3 times BTU content over the material. A 3 times coverage for the material may be justifiable.

Continued

625 Levy — Under adversed conditions, coatings can be breached. Many assemblies have combustible cores with incombustible finishes, but it is still a combustible assembly.

640 Cammisa — Second Mr. Degenkolb's motion to deny the variance request for the use of the Dryvit System for exterior wall surfacing for use on Type 1 through Type 4 construction.

The motion was passed as follows:

Ayes	Nays	Abstain
Cammisa	Rockwell	Gendler
Kennedy		
Degenkolb		

NEW BUSINESS

Item 4 — NO. 79-10 ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED: MEI LUN YUEN PROJECT; 1-JOB APPROVAL REQUEST FOR USE OF DRYVIT SYSTEM; SECTION 1801, S.F.BUILDING CODE.

710 Levy — The building is 27 feet from the building across the street. The applicant is asking for a 1-job approval. His comments on the previous request holds for this one also.

724 Kaplan — This is an exterior panelized system. The joints will be appropriately sealed. The south end of the building is essentially on the property line and they do not intend to use Dryvit here.

730 Gendler — The Dryvit will be used on the other 3 sides. What is the thickness?

Kaplan — 2" to be used.

745 Rockwell — Having denied general approval request, must have special circumstances to allow a 1-job approval. The setbacks must be analyzed.

750 Kaplan — Described the history and background of the project.

770 Rockwell — This discussion is not relevant. Board is concerned with setbacks and other saving features with regard to fire access.

780 Kaplan — There is good accessibility. Sacramento St, is 60 ft. wide. There are no enclosed wells and no balconies. The windows are integral with the wall system.

Continued

800 Levy — Sacramento St, appears to be about 50 ft. wide. The building (Bldg. "B") across Joyce St, appears to be a 3 story plus basement Type 5 building with exposure about 25 feet away.
The north and west side appears to have exposure problems.

820 McKlem — Is this a completely and fully sprinklered building?

822 Kaplam — The building is fully sprinklered.

830 Kennedy — How is vandalism handled.

832 DeManty — The material cannot be reached at ground level.

DISCUSSION

* Narrowness of Joyce St, and steepness of Sacramento St.
* Roof of garage designed for fire truck loading.
* Beginning level of Dryvit application--2nd level.
* Sprinklering of building
* Accessibility to fire fighting on 3 sides

875 Levy — Separation required between combustibles on Joyce St, 5% Wood; Sacramento, 10% wood and 10% wood facing the Plaza. All based on 3/4 inch thickness.

Some equivalency could be granted since the material is less combustible than wood.

925 Rockwell — Discussed degree of combustibility. But problem is the assembly is not a single material but a composite material.

Motion to approve the variance as a 1-job approval with the Dryvit material limited to 2 inch thickness, on 3 sides of the building with caulking to be approved by the Bureau of Building Inspection.

The motion was seconded and passed as follows:
Ayes = Messrs. Gendler, Rockwell, Cammisa, Degenkolb
Nays = Mr. Kennedy.

Item 6 — 79-12 WON-DOOR CORPORATION: GENERAL APPROVAL 162 W18.1: MOVABLE PARTITION RESTRICTED TO GROUP C OCCUPANCY, BD. OF EXAMINERS FILE NO. 70-6; SECTS. 2312.B SFBC REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

1037 Levy — This is a request for a 1-job approval for an interior partition on tracks that does not meet the load deflection requirements of Sec. 2312.B. He is not too worried about

CONTINUED

it. The only problems at over-load conditions would be minor maintenance problems at the track support.

1060 Kirmayer — This is a single wall system on a double track. The design is extremely tough and can take a lot of give. That is the reason why Holiday Inns have installed so many of thesesystems throughout the country.

1073 Levy — Noted that the partitions had been approved for schools by a previous Board hearing, File No. 76-20

1080 Cammisa — Motion to grant approval.

Motion was S & P unanimously.

Item 7 — 79-13 EKOSE'A: MCGOWAN RESIDENCE, FAITH ST: SOLAR HEATING MECHANICAL SMOKE EXHAUST SYSTEM: SECTS. 5130.1.3 & 5130.1.4 SFBC: REQUEST FOR VARIANCE.

Because of the long agenda and lateness of the hour, the Board decided that there would be insufficient time to consider Item 7 on Solar Heating. The applicants agreed to a postponement and the next meeting was set for Monday, April 30 to consider this item.

At Mr. Levy's suggestion, the Board decided to hear the essentials of the proposed variance in order that the applicant may be better prepared to give their presentation on April 30.

090 Levy — This is a request for the use of a passive type of solar heating system for a single family unit without the use of a back-up heating system. Three problems are presented that are code violations:

1. No fire stopping is indicated. The system does not provide for normal ducting of air.
2. Light and air - the amount of openable windows is not sufficient. Cannot assume that windows opening onto the solarium area are opening to the outside.
3. Code requires maintenance of 70°F., temperature between 6 am and 12 pm. Necessary to have a back-up system.

125 Barson — The system is already working in several locations. The requirements for human comfort are met. Other jobs in several other areas do not require back-up systems. Openable windows lead to solarium and can be assumed as one space. With regard to the need for fire-stopping, conceal draft openings are cut off and the space is not accessible. The top of the unit has a shut-off with a fusible damper. There is no direct connection of the air circulation system to the living area except as a circulating air envelope.

Continued

Meeting was adjourned at 10:40 PM

Next meeting scheduled for Monday 4/30/79 at 7 PM.

Recorded by

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

cc: SFFD, Chief Graham
City Librarian
City Engineer
BID
PAD
PID

MC/ma

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Meeting of April 16, 1979

ATTENDEES

PLEASE PRINT:

79-8 DRYVIT SYSTEM	AFFILIATION
Raymond T Lynch	Sales Mgr
C. Thomas Fuchsman	Reg Mgr
A. Benton Bledsoe	Manuf. Rep.
GALEN THOMAS	" "
JOHN DANLJ MARCONI PLSTG Co	PLASTERING CONTR.
Rudy Meisswinkel	Fred Meisswinkel Inc.
David L. Randall	Frank H. Smith Co.
R Darnell	Plastering Bureau
John Watt	

79-10 ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED		
ERNEST DeMANTI	ARCHITECT	ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED
Chas W Kamm		Gen Contractor (Emkay)

79-11 ORME & GRABSTEIN

RICHARD M. GRABSTEIN

FOR G. O'CONNOR

79-12 WON-DOOR CORPORATION

K. Kinnaeyer — Asst. Innkeeper Holiday Inn
R. Morey — Won Door Corp, Director

79-13 EKOSE'A

William Pearson, architect Ekoseá
[illegible], developer, McDonnan house
[illegible] owner, developer

79-14 ROLF JENSEN & ASSOC.

Norman J Koonsand

79-15 ROLF JENSEN & ASSOC.

Norman J Koonsand

SF
285.35
#2
1/23/79

BOARD OF EXAMINERS MINUTES

Meeting

July 23, 1979

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs Gendler, Whittaker, Cammisa, Degenkolb & Kennedy

SECRETARY: Robert C. Levy, Superintendent, BBI
M. Choy, Deputy Superintendent, BBI

BBI: A. Corenevsky

SFFD: Chief W. Graham

TAPE 109
Side 1

000 Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM by Mr. Gendler

005 Adoption of Agenda. Item 3, Electrical Board of Examiners cancelled

010 Mr. Whittaker moved that all future meetings until January of next year be held on nights other than Monday nights.

015 Motion was S&P unanimously

017 Approval of Minutes, 4/30/79 Meeting. MS&P unanimously.

024 Levy The AIA has not yet furnish replacement for Mr. Rockwell. Expect that the replacement will be on board for the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 4 MEI LUN YUEN CHINATOWN HOUSING, STOCKTON & SACRAMENTO STREETS, ARCHITECTS, ASSOCIATED, ERNEST DEMANTY, AIA MIXED OCCUPANCIES, SECTION 503A, SFBC, Variance Request.

028 Levy This is a Type 5 building with a Type 1 garage. Referred to Sec. 503.A of the SFBC where it states that change of occupancy supplemental to main use shall be less than 15% of the area. This section of the Code was promulgated as a means to allow a small office in a warehouse. If the F2 occupancy is greater than 15%, the level becomes another floor. Sec. 1702.1, SFBC, provides that the top of the Type 1 garage can be used as the podium ground level provided certain conditions are met:

1. 2 means of access by Fire Department. Only 1 provided.

2. Area proposed greater than 15%. The building above cannot be permitted as Type 5 but may be Type 3. Architect has not responded to this alternative.

Continued

060 Corenevsky: This project dates back to 1974 when the original design was submitted. They are only providing a 16 ft. wide driveway where 60 ft. is required since this is a private right of way with a dead end. The type of building has been completely changed since the Goldberg ruling of 1974. The permit is based on the 1974 concept, however the latest submittal is completely changed. The maximum F2 allowed is 15%, They have proposed C occupancy that would mean children down below grade. This is a hazard and could not be allowed.

082 DeManty Had meeting and understanding with Mr. Goldberg in 1974 for a podium structure of Type 1 garage with multiple structure above per Sec. 1702.1. The base structure included parking and commercial and had nothing to do with the 15% requirement. The garage has since been reduced to about 1/2 of the original size. Have 2 written approvals from BBI, the 1st with the 15% requirement omitted and the 2nd with the 15% requirement. Met with Fire Department people in 7/15/74 and discussed Fire Department access problem. The understanding was that BBI would go along if FD did not object. It was assumed that FD agreed since it is FD policy to answer only if they disagree.

At that time they were seeking to have C occupancy in ground floor of Building C. Because of various difficulties that idea was dropped and they had since tried to put the C occupancy in the garage instead. This was based on early approvals by Goldberg which was never rescinded.

They are now appealing the 15% requirement to the Board. A precedent has been established to permit this since they have been given a basic approval of mixed occupancy. with no percentage restriction. There is a fire separation between base occupancy and floors above with a 4-hr separation in between.

134 Whittaker: There is no record of BBI actions post 1974. Would like to be brought up to date on later actions.

137 Levy Letter of 5/11/77 talks about the 15% requirement.

140 Corenevsky: They had a meeting in 1975 and DeManty was told that there were errors which had to be corrected. They were allowed the 15% occupancy change. 8 months later the design was withdrawn by the architect.

The applicant was aware of the 15% limitation in 1975.

155 DeManty: That is probably true but they are now appealing it.

Continued

160 Whittaker — This variance should be considered on its own merit and not on something that was approved and rescinded.

165 Corenevsky — Referred to Board of Examiners File 76-22 date 8/5/76 in which Maisin Development asked for 10% occupancy change in a 4 story over Type 1 garage. The garage occupancy was for manager's office and guards. This request was turned down by the Board. The situation was even under better conditions being that the garage was at grade and there were 3 street access by the Fire Department.

170 Levy — Gather that Chief Condon was satisfied with the access in this case. The buildings are required to be sprinklered for other reasons.

Building C, which doesn't front on a street, is required to be sprinklered.

Problem of determining equivalence.

185 Whittaker — If Building C is on grade, the percentage limitation doesn't apply.

190 Corenevsky — Sprinklers are being used for 2 separate items. Private right of way needs 40 ft open to the sky.

195 DeManty — The 16 feet has been ok'd for 1 access and sprinkler substitute ok'd for the 2nd.

200 Corenevsky — The exiting is shared between the buildings.

205 Goldberg — Two issues involved.
1. Equivalence of podium to ground.

2. Percentage allowed for other than garage use.

The 1974 letter stipulated acceptance by the FD and BBI with the sprinklers added. The proposal was to sprinkler the Type 5 building over the garage. The 15% requirement applies to higher hazard and would not apply in this case since the garage occupancy is the higher hazard. F3 is higher hazard than F2. The Code does not require than F2 be sprinklered.

226 Corenevsky — Sprinklers are required by Code in garage areas. The code section was written to take care of warehouses where fire separations are needed.

Continued

235 Levy — Disagrees with Mr. Goldberg. The Golden Gateway Project is not the same case since Type 4 structures are involved. There are 2 ways in which commercial occupancy is allowed:

1. If it meets 1702.1 requirements.

2. If 1702.1 requirements are not met than the 15% limitation applies.

250 Goldberg — In the Golden Gateway Project, if it was 2 blocks away Type 5 would have been OK. Because it was within the fire limits, Type 4 was required. This project meets 1702.1.

255 Levy — 1702.1.C is not met. Two means of access have not been provided. The FD ruling on the matter of two access was rescinded in 1977.

265 BOARD DISCUSSION

- Building C not on platform and not involved.
- Day Care Center proposal in garage.
- Vehicular & pedestrian access.
- Podium as ground.
- Meaning of F2/C occupancy.
- Garage not exempt as story if over floor of occupancy.
- No penetrations permitted in separation, vertical & horizontal.

325 Levy — What is time table for construction?

329 DeManty — Site permit is waiting for this decision. The economics is dependent on the amount of F2/C area permitted. Type 3 construction is not feasible economically.

340 Degenkolb — For the F2/C occupancy, a complete 4-hr slab and wall separation should be required with no penetrations permitted. If complete separation can be effected it will no longer be a mixed occupancy.

380 Levy — Podium is considered as ground but there are not 2 FD means of access. Therefore if we cannot consider podium as ground that will constitute 6 stories of Type 5. If the occupancy below is limited to 15% than 4 stories of Type 5 is acceptable.

400 Goldberg — The concept was stipulated by the FD and approved by BBI. Nothing has changed.

408 Corenevsky — Type, size and configuration have been changed.

Continued

430 DeManty — They are withdrawing the C occupancy. The F2/F3 occupancy will be completely sprinklered. All floors of the Type 5 structure will be sprinklered. Everything on the site is sprinklered.

460 Degenkolb — Dry standpipes can be added for additional protection.

470 Degenkolb — Motion to accept request for the mixed occupancy in the Type 1 base structure subject to the following conditions:

1. Podium level shall be considered as ground level with 16' wide access ramp as shown.

2. The garage levels and building above shall be sprinklered throughout.

3. Building C is not considered under this approval.

4. Dry standpipes shall be as required by the Fire Department in order to provide water from street.

5. Group C occupancy shall not be permitted.

6. The limitation on F-2 occupancy shall be as per marked up Plans A-2, A-11, A-17, and A-18; Board of Examiner submittal.

7. Provide 4 hour occupancy separation between F2 and F3. 3 hr separation shall be permitted at stair vestibules.

Motion was S&P unanimously.

ITEM 5
No. 79-19 — ON LOK HOUSING, EXCAVATION SHORING AND UNDERPINNING, 1441 POWELL ST. SHAPIRO, OKINO HOM & ASSOCIATES, REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF PERMIT, QUALIFICATION AS SOIL ENGINEERS, SECTION 2901.1, SFBC.

535 Levy — Basically the soil engineer has not provided the design criteria for the shoring. The firm of Shapiro, Okino & Hom has interpreted the test data and recommended soil design criteria for the shoring which is lower than the design criteria for the permanent structure. BBI does not have soil engineers to evaluate and judge whether or not such design criteria is reasonable or acceptable.

The problem in accepting SOH is that a precedence could be set whereby any Civil Engineer could be presumed qualify to interpret test borings and come up with soil design criteria which may or may not be proper.

Continued

585 Shapiro — They feel qualify to interpret soil report data as it relates to temporary shoring. The soil report did not recommend temporary criteria, only permanent criteria. For other jobs maybe more information would be required from the Soil Engineer.

610 Hom — Discussed their company background. In 9 1/2 years have designed 257 temporary shoring jobs of which 106 were in San Francisco. The design criteria for temporary structureswas not included in 30% of their project soil reports. All of their projects are submitted with soil reports. The design criteria for temporary shoring in this case is the same as was used in the Chinatown Salvation Army Center Building which is in near proximity.

They have no wish to qualify as Soil Engineers, but they are specialists in temporary soil retaining structures per Sec. 2902.5.1.

640 Gendler — The structural or civil engineer should review with the soil engineer such soil design criteria.

650 Degenkolb — Generally the design engineer of the building designs the temporary shoring without going back to the soil engineer. However some do and some don't review the criteria with the soil engineer. Criteria could be set up to prevent one from being an "instant" soil engineer.

589 Levy — The ON LOK Project is not an issue before the Board. What is pertinent is whether Shapiro, Okino & Hom is qualify to interpret as soil engineer for temporary shoring design criteria.

What would be criteria for firm's acceptance by the Board and how applicable for the next person who might want the same thing?

702 Cammisa — Understands that the load criteria is not generally checked.

745 Shapiro — They would like the Board to determine whether they qualify to do what they did.

750 Levy — If this firm is qualify then the precedence set may allow any civil engineer to determine loading. We could require that the soil engineer address soil values for temporary shoring.

790 Degenkolb — Motion that all soil reports shall include design criteria for temporary shoring where applicable. BBI shall issue bulletin in this regard.

Continued

795 Shapiro — Agrees that this motion satisfies their concerns.

Motion was S& P unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 6 79-20 — GEORGE R MOSCONE CONVENTION CENTER (YBC) CONCRETE TESTING, TURNER CONSTRUCTION CO. SEC. 2604.3.1 Variance Request.

800 Levy — Request involves lesser frequency for concrete testing of mat foundation for the project as required by Sec. 2604.3.1 of the San Francisco Building Code. Other jobs with mat foundations have been required to comply, therefore can see no reason or logic for reducing the frequency of testing and the number of cylinder breaks at 28 days.

820 Dorais — They are requesting strength test samples be taken once for every 500 cy. instead of every 150 cy., with the number of cylinder breaks in 28 days reduced from 2 to 1. They will provide 1 in 7 days, 1 in 28 days and 1 in reserve.

The mat is low strength concrete and only 3000 psi concrete is involved. The taking of more cylinders will not achieve better safety since it is not known exactly where in the mat placement the cylinders could be ascribed to. Money savings are $22,000 in the reduce frequency of testing and $9000 in the lesser amount of cylinders; a total of $31,000. Believe that they are meeting the spirit of the Code. They have letters of concurrence from T. Y. Lin's office and Hales Testing Laboratory.

870 Dur in (HTL) — They recommended to Turner Construction to make the variance request since the reduction in frequency and lesser number of cylinders does not affect safety or quality control in a job of this type or size. Cited some City jobs in which they have reduced the frequency of concrete testing and number of cylinders.

900 Gendler — Does the City know about lowering of the frequency in the jobs mentioned?

905 Levy — This was never requested.
ACI and UBC call for the same frequency and cylinder breaks. This requirement has been in existence for a long time and this is the first request for variance encountered.

905 Dorais — The Code specifies test samples once for each 150 c.y. or for each 5000 sf of surface. The variance if granted for 500 c.y. would entail 2500 sf of surface area.

Continued

This is a CAO run project. The money required for testing will be ultimately paid for by the City.

970
Levy — The most severe limitation of the Code governs in this case. A relatively thin slab would involve a proportionately larger surface area and vice versa.

980
Degenkolb — Motion to approve a 1-job variance for the foundation mat, 3000 psi concrete only, subject to the following conditions

1. Allow 1 strength test for every 400 cy for quantities between 1500 and 2000 cy.

2. Allow 1 strength test for every 500 cy for quantities greater than 2000 cy.

3. Minimum of 3 cylinder breaks: 7 days/28 days/reserve.

4. Shall have adequate laboratory control.

5. Shall have thorough inspection.

BBI will investigate suitability for code change of Sec. 2604.3.

Motion S&P unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM.

Recorded:

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

cc: SFFD, Chief W. Graham
Board of Examiners Members
City Librarian
City Engineer
BID
PAD

MC/ay

BOARD OF EXAMINERS MEETING

July 23, 1979

ATTENDANCE

	NAME	AFFILIATION
79-18		
Mei Lun Yuen	Cynthia Joe	Presbyterian Church in Chin
	ERNEST DeMANTY	ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED
	THOMAS LEE	ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATED
	Al Goldberg	Goldberg R/D Assoc
79-19		
ON LOK	Daniel Shapiro	Shapiro, Okino, Hom & Asso
	[illegible] H. Hom	
79-20		
YBC	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]

SF
P85.35
#2
9-25-79

S.F. Public Library
Docs

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
DEC 7 1979
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS, APPEALS

Meeting

September 25, 1979

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Lera, Cammisa, Whittaker, Degenkolb, Cooper

SECRETARY: Robert Levy, Superintendent, BBI

Ken Lewis, Chief Plumbing Inspector
Harold Dubay, Electrical Inspector

No representative from the Fire Dept.

TAPE 109
Side 2
00

Meeting called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Mr. Degenbolb, who was asked by the other Board members to preside over this meeting in the absence of Mr. Gendler.

Adoption of Agenda. Item 4, AISC postponed to the next meeting at the request of Dave Michaut of AISC. Mr. Levy requested to add a new item, No. 6, concerning code revisions.

Approval of Minutes, 7/23/79 meeting. MS&PU.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 3
75-1

ETL TESTING LABORATORIES, INC. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF BOARD OF ELECTRICAL'S CONDITIONAL APPROVAL AS ELECTRICAL TESTING LABORATORY TO INCLUDE OTHER SPECIFIC ITEMS.

032
Levy

ETL, formerly known as Electrical Testing Laboratories, was approved by this Board in 1975 to test and label products in 4 specific area. They are now apparently asking for a blanket approval. The major consideration for the Board is whether ETL has acquired the capability and expertise since 1975 to be granted a blanket approval similar to one given to UL. However, UL has a long and proven track record, and a mechanism for feedback and follow up service on how their approved products perform in service.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
DEC 7 1979
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

How will ETL handle products which do not have UL or NEC approvals? What jurisdictions have given ETL a blanket approval, or denied such a request?

059
R. Naysmith
V.P. - ETL

Promised to submit several typical reports done recently. Ninety-five percent of ETL tests are done to some recognized standards, such as UL. When there is no one standard that is completely appropriate, ETL will use appropriate portions from several standards. An example is their recent approval of the Fasar Induction Range. The electronics in the range were evaluated to electronics safety standards, and the range characteristics against range safety standards.

ETL does not promulgate standards of their own.

Has not approved industrial control panels to date.

Has been accepted as a testing laboratory in San Francisco for specific equipment. For example, roof equipment was installed in a S.F. building in 1975 which has no UL label. ETL was called in to test, evaluate, and label the equipment. Mr. Goldberg accepted ETL report and conclusion that equipment was safe.

100
Levy

What cities have given ETL blanket approval?

States of New York, Oregon, Washington. Cities of Phoenix, Chicago, Baltimore, Denver, and others.

What about Los Angeles?

No. Have applied. No response to our application to date.

What about follow up service?

On initial plant visit ETL is concerned with the facilities, quality control program, and manufacturing procedures as they impact on

quality control. After that the minimum follow up service is once every three months; could be more often as experience dictates. For products which are produced intermittently, follow up intervals may be longer than 3 calendar months, but not more than 3 "production months."

What mechanism does ETL use to get feedback on satisfactory field performance? Do you have something similar to UL's Electrical Council?

No. ETL belongs to several organizations that have electrical inspectors in the memberships. Through informal discussions with the inspectors, ETL generally becomes aware of products it labels that have problems.

Do you publish an annual list of approvals?

A list is published semi-annually.

Are you looking for a "blanket approval," or only for items similar to ones with UL and ANSI approvals?

ETL may list products which are not listed by UL or ANSI, but the evaluations will be based on established standards. Again, Fasar ranges is an example.

151
Levy — Can you categorize the areas where ETL may be interested in working in?

ETL is interested in products in which it has experience. ETL has been in business since 1896, although its testing activity dates back only ten years.

Levy — Cites UL strengths and background. Is ETL equivalent? Does not know, not biased against ETL, just raising the issue for the Board to consider.

128
Cammisa — Can ETL tell how it is different from UL

ETL — ETL has field offices like UL, but does no testing at those locations. Testing is done only at headquarters. The range of testing activities is not as extensive as UL's.

Levy — Is ETL asking for testing of all electrical products?

Yes. Test for standards that already exist.

200 Degenkolb — How about approval for just the items listed in the request letter? If ETL becomes involved in other items in the future, it can apply again.

Levy — Suggests approving list in letter provisionally, with a report from the Superintendent back to the Board after some period of time.

Cammisa — Which standard on this list covers the Fasar ranges?

ETL — UL Standard 858.

Levy — The ETL reports covering specific products are not received by BBI. Also, BBI does not have the ability to review and store such reports. Thus ETL's approval for Fasar, which was partly based on UL858, also included other considerations which BBI has no knowledge of (because it does not get the reports).

280 Duba[illegible] — Would prefer a code number on the ETL label affixed to a product, similar to UL's.

ETL — Label has a manufacturer's code (control number).

353 Cammisa — Moves that items on pages 1 and 2 of request letter be approved on a provisional basis. Review later in light of experience. Can combine different recognized standards. Cannot use unrecognized standards.

Further Board discussion.

382 Degenkolb — Restates motion as follows: ETL be approved to test and label the items listed in its request letter, to the standards listed therein, for an interim period of two years. In certain cases, combinations of UL and ANSI standards may be used where suitable. The Superintendent shall report back to the Board as to the track record at the end of two years. MS&PU.

NEW BUSINESS

Items 79-21 — Banker & Marks, India Basin Industrial Park. Variance to S.F.P.C. Sec. 213, Independent Systems.

403 Levy — Briefly expains the situation. Proposed Building B

drains to an 8" Ø existing sewer lateral. This lateral is too small to handle entire roof drainage, so 3 drains are proposed to connect to a new 12"Ø lateral that will serve Building A. Such an arrangement is prohibited by the Plumbing Code.

Lewis — This property could easily be split into several parcels in the future. Who will then be responsible for maintenance? Private sewers are a pain because everyone shrugs off the responsibility. Then BBI gets pulled in and/or blamed.

477
Peter Testa — The intention, and the design, assumes the property will always be one parcel. For example, all the parking is adjacent to Building B, and if the two buildings are split in ownership, Building A would have no parking.

Fillmore
Marks — Willing to accept a deed restriction against ever splitting the property.

Levy — Either deed restriction, or if split, then a spelling out of responsibility for sewer maintenance and creating easements.

520
Whittaker — Motions that variance be granted. Recorded statement that if and when lot is divided, appropriate measures must be taken to provide for drainage that is satisfactory to BBI. Buildings not to be occupied until statement is recorded. MS&PU.

Item 6 — <u>CODE REVISIONS</u>

540
Levy — BBI is starting its periodic code review task. One area that may benefit from a change or a clarification is the relationship between this Board and the Board of Permit Appeals.

1. Jurisdiction question between BE and BPA. Suggest code language that an item going to BPA must, if it is a technical matter, be referred to the BE for recommendations. Currently, an applicant has a choice of two, or even 3, boards, and can choose the most advantageous route.

2. Desirability of putting into Building Code a requirement that BPA make a formal finding, i.e. reasons would become a part of the motion, and would be transmitted to the applicant. The findings, in draft form, would be reviewed and concurred to

by the Board members, then finalized.
This procedure should also apply to EE.

will bring up #1 again at the next meeting.

650 Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Recorded:

Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

cc: S.F.P.D., Chief Graham
Board of Examiner members
City Librarian
City Engineer
BID
EID
PID
PAD

SF
P85.35
#2
12/6/79

City Librarian
S.F. Main Library
Docs

SF Public Works

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

DEC 20 1979

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

BOARD OF EXAMINERS MINUTES

Meeting

December 6, 1979

Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Messrs. Cammisa, Whittaker, Gendler (Chairman) Degenkolb, Cooper and Kennedy

SECRETARY: M. Choy, Deputy Superintendent BBI

K. Lewis, Chief Plumbing Inspector
T. Lehane, Plumbing Inspector
R. H. Register, Building Plans Engineer

S.F.F.D. No representative from the Fire Department

TAPE 110
Side 1
00 Meeting called to order at 7:00 by Mr. Gendler

Item 1 Agenda adopted

Item 2 Approval of minutes of September 25, 1979. MS&PU.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 3
79-20 AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF STEEL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSED CODE CHANGE OF SECTION 2708.1 SFBC ON COMPOSITE CONSTRUCTION (DEFERRED FROM SEPTEMBER 25, 1979 MEETING)

030
Choy Presented request from AISC for proposed Code Change. He asked a representative of the AISC if the proposed codechange would be similar to the requirements in the 1979 Uniform Building Code. Jim Marsh of AISC replied that the two codes are identical in effect.

Choy indicated 3 options opened to the Board:

1. Power to grant direct approval if proposal can be determined to be equal or safer than the Code in all respects.

2. Power to grant a variance on a one-job basis where safety is not involved.

3. Power to recommend a code change.

Continued

The code change option would take about 1½ years and is already in the making. BBI is presently engaged in updating the S.F.Building Code and the 79 UBC is being used as the model code for direct comparison. Final inclusions would be based upon input from various Code making groups and interested organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, SEAONC, AIA and the AISC.

070
Jim Marsh

Jim Marsh, AISC stated that to not use the latest up-to-date knowledge was unprofessional and possibly would make the designer legally liable. Also the task of obtaining a one-job approval was very time consuming and required each different owner or engineer to waste considerable time.

090
Dave Michaut

Dave Michaut, AISC, indicated that general jobs in San Francisco had been designed using this system. He mentioned 333 Market Street, Levi Plaza, Federal Reserve and Crocker Bank.

110
Choy

Stated that he has no knowledge of such approvals and asked if they had written approval from the Bureau of Building Inspection.

Michaut didn't have any letters with him to confirm this.

120 & 190

Discussion by Board and applicants.

Gendler again asked for confirmation that the proposed changes would be in conformity with the latest U.B.C. Marsh assured the Board that the changes proposed would modify the 1975 SFBC and portions of other codes referred to in the 1975 SFBC so that it would result in identicalrequirements to the 79 UBC.

200
Degenkolb

Degenkolb moved that the proposed change be approved as equivalent to the Code requirements in all respects and that the City consider such an interpretation as a code change in the future. This would be a direct approval for such use now.

Motion seconded by Cammisa and passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS
Item 4
79-22

505 SANSOME STREET, PACIFIC MUTUAL BUILDING, E.H. MORILL CO., INSTALLATION OF BALCONY DRAINS. REQUEST FOR VARIANCE OF SECTION 909A, SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODE.

Continued

212
Choy

Choy stated that the problem is that approximately 600 unapproved type drains have been installed at 505 Sansome Street. The drains were without flanges and weigh approximately 1/2 pound each whereas in approved type weigh approximately 10 pounds each with a clamping flange required by the Plumbing Code.

230
Lewis

Chief Plumbing Inspector Lewis stated that the drains installed do not conform to the Plumbing Code general requirements.

A sample drain similar to the one installed but smaller was displayed by Mr. Lewis.

250
Lehane

District Plumbing Inspector Lehane stated that on March 7, 1979 he had made an inspection and discovered that unapproved type drains were being installed. He told the job foreman that he could not accept them unless they would get approval for them. The foreman told him that they were practically all installed but indicated he would check and let the inspector know what they intended to do.

275
Giamoca

John Giacoma of E.H. Morrill Co., representing owner, said the drain was similar but not identical to the one shown by Lewis. He described each deck as being approximately 4 ft by 8 ft and said he felt the drain was adequate for the purpose.

335
Gendler

Gendler asked why they didn't stop installing the drains when notified that they were not acceptable. Giacoma said the job was too far along at that point and that the City was too slow in considering approvals. He said he didn't consider this a floor drain but a roof drain and that Sec. 909.A of the SFPC was not applicable.

390
Hellman

Albert Hellman of Hellman & Luber representing owner described drain installation and emphasized small balcony size.

420
Whittaker

Whittaker asked if drains were needed. Hellman replied that driven rain could get in, therefore drains were necessary.

450
Cammisa

Cammisa asked if the City had list of approved drains. Lewis said no, that the general code requirement would be followed to select approved type.

Continued

General discussion follows:

590 Hellman — Hellman said that to chip out existing drains and installing approved type would result in a worse situation. This was generally acknowledged.

610 Degenkolb — Degenkolb expressed concern that the exterior elastomeric waterproofing system on the deck would probably fail within 10 years and the City may be held liable based upon acceptance of unapproved type drains.

More general discussion from all parties.

640 Lewis — Lewis stated that his concern is whether or not these drains can be approved inasmuch as other will want to use them if acceptable.

650 Kennedy — Kennedy moved to deny the request for a variance to the Plumbing Code.

Cooper seconded motion.

Vote Aye's-Degenkolb, Cooper, Kennedy, Gendler
No's- Whittaker, Cammisa

Motion passed 4 to 2 to deny request.

Further discussion after motion passed.

770 — Applicants were informed by the Board that it would be possible to apply to the Board again if they have any additional information or proposal for the Board to consider.

Item 6 of the 9/25/79 meeting on the jurisdiction question between Board of Examiners and Board of Permit Appeals and incorporation of procedural changes as Code changes will be taken up at the next meeting.

Recorded:

for Robert C. Levy, Secretary
Board of Examiners

cc: SFFD: Chief Graham
Board of Examiners Members
City Librarian
City Engineer
BID
EID
PID
PAD

/ma

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
12/6/79

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

	Name	Affiliation
79-20	Jim Marsh	AISC
AISC	Steve Jeffries	TRW-NELSON DIVISION
	Bill Smith	American Iron & Steel Institute
	David M. Michaut	American Institute of Steel Construction
79-22	John Giacoma	E. H. Morrill Co.
505 Sansome	Albert Hellman	Hellman & lober
	William Grossman	Wm. Simpson
	Tom Lehane	City & County of S. F.
	Kenneth Lewis	City & County of S. F.

12/13/79
MC/ma

SF
B85.35
#2
5/19/80

BOARD OF EXAMINERS MINUTES

Meeting

May 19, 1980

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 6 1980
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MEMBERS PRESENT : Messrs. Gendler (Chairman), Cammisa, Degenkolb, Whittaker, and D'Amico

SECRETARY : R. C. Levy, Superintendent, BBI
M. Choy, Deputy Superintendent, BBI

S.F.F.D. : Chief W. Graham
E. Anderson, Sr. Mechanical Engineer

Mr. Gendler introduced new Architect Member Mr. D'Amico.

Item 1 Agenda adopted.

Item 2 Approval of Minutes, 3/17/80 meeting, MS & PU.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 3 (72-17) AUDIO ALERT SYSTEM: H. Goodwater, President; Provisional Approval 900 A 40.1; Previous Extension of Time expired on 4/18/79; Request for further Extension of Time until April of 1981 pending testing per new UL Test Criteria UL 1480, effective date October 1980.

018 Levy Audio Alert System dates back to 1972 when it was heard by the Board of Examiners. The approval was provisional on UL approval of the system within a reasonable time period. Has no objection to a one-year extension provided it is to be the last extension of its kind and shall be of one year duration. Inquired as to when they plan to submit to UL for testing.

023 Goodwater Have already submitted.

025 Levy The Bureau will need a letter from Goodwater confirming this action. This extension is not to exceed one year and the approval is subject to normal Code requirements.

Continued

030 Gendler	If LA approval has been obtained, City should also have copy of approval. Mr. Goodwater agreed to furnish copy.
034 Graham	Is the system State Fire Marshal Listed? Mr. Goodwater replied affirmatively.
047 Whittaker	Moved that the approval be granted for one year subject to usual requirements. MS & PU.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 4	VINYL SASH MANUFACTURING CO.; Charles M. Flynn, President; Use of PVC in window frame extrusions; Sections 1705.B.1, and 5202, S.F. Building Code; Request for Variance.
050 Levy	The use of PVC in window frame extrusions does not meet Code. Sec. 1705.B.1 requires that replacement of sash in Types 1,2,3, and 4 buildings shall be with metallic sash or by metal covered wood. Vinyl may be allowed in Type 5 buildings provided flammability testing is done per ASTM E-84. The tunnel test submitted is by Foster Snell which has not been approved by the Bureau. Steiner Tunnels must pass a "Round-Robin" test series to assure that test results are valid. Noted also that the Smoke Density is by another method not prescribed by Code, therefore the SD rating has not been established.
075 Flynn	(Charles Flynn, Pres. of Vinyl Sash) It is not possible to test the extrusion in the Steiner Tunnel. The Optical Density is the Smoke Density. Although the test was submitted by Foster Snell, the test was actually done by United States Testing Co.'s Steiner Tunnel. Reiterated that the extrusion cannot be mounted in the tunnel.
089 Levy	The test submitted was an E-84 with F.S. and Fuel Contribution ratings indicated. How was this done if not in the tunnel?
093 Flynn	Cannot explain how but that was what he was told.

Continued

103 Gendler — What kind of evidence is there to show this could be alternate to Code.

105 Flynn — Explained window sash details and the use of metal reinforcing in some master frames.

General Discussion on Michael & Pfeffer approval on steel reinforced PVC window and door frames:

. Applies to life safety buildings only

. 3 feet vertical discontinuity of frames on successive stories

. Assembly is reinforced by steel tube frame - not the case of the current request.

125 Levy — The Michael & Pfeffer approval is only for Life Safety Buildings and addresses the problem of fire from outside and inside. Can't see how PVC sash can be equalled to metallic sash. Would need a Code change to allow vinyl sash. SD is a problem. How do you correlate optical density to smoke density.

137 Whittaker — The Code is obvious that it restricts such use in Types 1,2,3, and 4 buildings.

BOARD DISCUSSION

. Low toxicity - but not relevant

. Self-extinguishing aspect but does have significant contribution to burning

. Non-combustibility requirement for Types 1,2, 3, and 4 buildings

. Michael & Pfeffer approval - windows have steel frames and wouldn't collapse

. Effect of sprinklering

. Energy aspects

190 Flynn — Their commercial window frames have steel frame. PG & E wants to use their windows as replacements in their 77 Beale Street building.

Continued

200 Levy	Believe that this building is not sprinklered - not a Life Safety building. Applicant is actually asking for a general approval. Suggested that the Board deny request for other than Type 5 buildings. For Type 5 consideration, they must clarify the smoke problem.
275 Degenkolb	Moved to deny for use in all buildings except for Type 5. Further consideration for Type 5 is contingent on submission of appropriate information or data clarifying the smoke problem. MS & PU.
Item 5	(80-4) STOREK & STOREK: Howard F. Schopman, AIA; 540 Bush Street; Primary Water Supply from City Water Mains; Section 3805.D.G., S.F. Building Code; Request for Variances; supplying for Fire Department hose connections and 15,000 gallon storage tank in lieu of supply from street main.
292 Levy	The various request involves water storage as source of supply. The Code requires 2 sources with the primary source from the City main. The existing main does not have the capacity to serve as the primary source. The 15,000 gallon could only supply sprinkler demand for 20 minutes maximum without consideration of the standpipe. The situation does not meet Code.
305 Graham	The main is a 6 inch line about 120 years old, badly occluded with diminished capacity, but must serve as primary supply. The 15,000 gallon tank serves only as reserve if something happens to the main.
310 Shopman	They found out from the Water Dept. that the 6 inch branch main which is a dead-end main has only the flow of a 2 or 3 inch main being badly occluded. They wanted to make modification and were told by SFWD that they had plan to up-grade a portion of the system in the future but not certain about being able to increase the flow unless a new 6 inch line is put in. This is not planned. The only plan to put in a re-circulation line to the present set-up.

Continued

330 Moore — The Fire Protection System is adequate. There are two fire pumps, a 15,000 gallon on-site tank, and the building is fully sprinklered. 180 gpm is only need for light hazard. The FD will supply own water anyway. There are three hydrants available from FD use only. Cannot see how system is degraded. They need only that the main be not considered as a primary source.

Mr. Moore then showed a large diagram of the water supply system showing the relation of the HP lines to the LP mains, the locations of the FD hydrants and the City hydrants, and the location of the buildings served by the 6" dead-end feeder main.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

. Sufficiency of capacity before FD pumpers can be hooked up and operative

. 300 gpm can be obtained

. Effect of low capacity on other buildings in adjacent area. The 6" line only serves a 6 story hotel, the applicants building, a church and convent

400 Andersen — (Eugene Andersen, Sr. Mech. Engineer, S.F.F.D.) Described water supply system and possibility of non-availability of water at the combination standpipes. Proposal to divide 15,000 gallon tank in two introduces possibility of unacceptable deficiency.

410 Moore — This proposal was to take care of maintenance, shut downs and would insure that there will always be at least 7,500 gallons available.

412 Gendler — Noted that the calculations used 15,000 gallons - as design basis.

415 Degenkolb — Talking about two sources of supply. Primary is the City Water Main, the other must be available if the main fails or is insufficient.

Continued

420 Moore	The sprinkler supply is satisfied but not the hose stream.
424 Moore	The demand is 340 gpm and they can get 300 gpm from the street main - Essentially they can get ordinary hazard supply by calculations.
426 Levy	They do not have the supply for the standpipe system per Sec. 3805.D.6, S.F.B.C.
430 Andersen	Under the 71 NFPA Code, a combination standpipe is required with 500 gpm required for the 1st and 240 gpm for the 2nd; a total of 740 gpm.
444 Gendler	Seems like that's what they have. The site is protected on both sides by H.P. water lines. The Fire Dept. could take over in say 5 minutes. Seems that there is enough for the sprinkler system and the 15,000 gallon supply.
470 Andersen	Under the worse condition with the tanks divided in half, the capacity is not adequate for 20 minutes. We're talking about only a 10 minute supply with a possibility of running out of water completely before the FD pumpers are available.
480 Cammisa	What are the alternatives? Sue the City for inadequate water supply or put in new 6" line.
500 Andersen	If variance is granted, a dangerous precedent may be set. Others is same situation will ask for the same variance.
510 Gendler	This is a special case. The applicant is stuck with a main that's inadequate through no fault of their own. Conceded that if the roads are block there may be a hazard.
535 Levy	This is a one job variance, not applicable to any others.
540 Degenkolb	Would FD notify SFWD of deficiency? Concern about other buildings without Life Safety and sprinklers. This building has this, therefore is not of great concern.

Continued

550 Whittaker — Move that the variance be granted as requested with the stipulation that the 15,000 gallon tank be not divided and pump capacity to remain at 750 gpm.

Motion seconded by Mr. Degenkolb on the basis of hardship and emphasizing that it's a one-time variance only.

The motion was passed unanimously.

600 Degenkolb — Moved that the Board be on record on safety and fire protection. That the Secretary and the Fire Marshal contact the Water Department advising them that any situation of insufficient water capacity as prescribed by Code for fire-fighting demands affects the safety of that section of the City and that the Water Department should take steps to redress such a situation.

Motion was MS & PU.

Item 6 — (80-6) STOREK & STOREK: Dennis M. Owens; 540 Bush Street; Door Swing Projection at Property Line; Section 4507, S.F. Building Code; Request for Variance.

605 Levy — Referred to Sec. 4507, S.F.B.C. which states that doors when opened or opening shall not project more than 1 foot beyond the property line. The request is for approval to project 3 feet beyond the property line. The Church supports this request and would rather have the projection than an alcove recess arrangement to accommodate the doors.

This is a clear violation of the Code. Suggest that the sidewalk could be closed on that side and have pedestrians on the other side of the street only.

610 Gendler — Suggest that bollards be placed on that side of the street to prevent pedestrian traffic.

620 Levy — This will require either a DPW order or Board of Supervisors action.

Continued

635
D'Amico

Move that the variance be granted provided that the sidewalk on that side be abandoned with bollards provided at the doors.

Motion was MS & PU.

Item 7

(80-7) KWA ARCHITECTS PLANNERS: William D. Kendall, AIA; 101 California Street; Curtain Wall System of extruded aluminum frame construction with special drywall protection; request for 1-job approval, new type of construction; Section 106 and 4302.B, S.F. Building Code.

648
Kendall

(William D. Kendall, AIA)
Introduced members of their team.

Seeking approval to use aluminum mullions and supporting members for the curtain wall on 101 California. Responsible judgement used in design and every effort made to comply with Code intent.

Describe the curtain wall design with the aid of two study models. Curtain wall has alternating vertical strips of glass and stone panels set in folded extruded aluminum frame. Glass lites are one inch thermal units - 2 pieces of glass separated by sealed air space. Stone panels are one inch thick and placed to allow drift movement when seismic forces act on the ductile structural frame.

Building designed as Life Safety building with complete fire sprinkler system. Described various items relating to unprotected openings, spandrels, structural designs, wind pressure design, seismic design, accommodation of movements, and use of aluminum. Average stone panel weight about the same as glass vision elements. Largest stone panel weighs 458 lbs. and smallest about 81 lbs.

101 California is a Life Safety building and the concept is essentially acceptable to BBI except that it is contingent upon the testing program and the results of the testing.

Continued

810 Gendler	Expressed concern about the ductility problem and what happens to the stone panels when building frame drifts.
820 Levy	Is concerned the use of aluminum with stone panels. There are probably many code violations if one looks into the Code in detail. The use of aluminum for supporting stone gives rise to concern of fire since aluminum melts at a low temperature. The double density sprinklers takes care of part of the problem. Concerned that the stone panels may drop in a fire situation.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

. Weight of stone panels vs. glass sandwich panels

. Flaking of granite at 1200°F

. Use of double density sprinklers allow 100% increase of unprotected openings

. Which might fall first in a fire, glass or stone?

. Structural design of system not worked out yet

. Proto-type for testing to include wracking test

955 Graham	If building is of completely glass curtain wall, would the use of aluminum be OK?
957 Levy	Yes, the Bureau has allowed that but that would depend on the thickness of the glass. Is concerned over the thickness of the stone.
960 Kendall	Their investigation shows that the glass would fall first then the stone. Discussed performance of other jobs with same over 10 years old. Performance testing is OK for buildings over 10 years old.
1020 Whittaker	Move to grant one job approval of the aluminum curtain wall system with stone and glass. The motion is for general scheme and the use of the materials only and not for details.

Continued

1025
Degenkolb

Mr. Degenkolb added the following concerns to the motion:

. Curtain wall design shall be by the Structural Engineer

. Wracking Test shall be provided. The criteria shall use reasonable expectable drift for a design earthquake, not necessarily code drift.

. System shall be with reasonable fire-proofing

. System shall have full ductility

. The alloy of aluminum used must provide the necessary ductility

Motion MS & PU.

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Recorded:

Robert C. Levy
Secretary
Board of Examiners

MC:ssg

cc: SFFD; Chief Graham
Board of Examiner Members
City Librarian
City Engineer
BID
EID
PAD

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

May 19, 1980

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

	NAME	AFFILIATION
72-17	Harry Goodwater	Audio Alert
80-5	Charles Flynn	Vinyl Sash
80-4	Howard Schopman	Storek & Storek
	Steven Moore	W. Digiacomo & Ass.
80-6	Dennis Owens	Storek & Storek
80-7	Bill Kendall	KWA Architects
	Tom Owens	
	Jay Hanan	
	Phil Bonzon	
	Bev Herman	
	Robert Rankin	
	Joe Colaco	
	Sandy Tandowsky	

5/19/80
MC:ssg

SF
P85.35
#1
2/23/87

SF Public Works

AMENDED

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

FEB. 23, 1987

AGENDA

Item 1. Adoption of Agenda

Item 2. Approval of Minutes of November 12, 1987

NEW BUSINESS

Item 3. ELECTRICAL BOARD OF EXAMINERS
File 87-1, Lithonia Reloc Wiring System; Request for Approval of Material of Construction

Item 4. BOARD OF EXAMINERS

File 87-2, 2336-40 Gough St; Anthony Pantaleoni, AIA, request for a variance from Sections 905 of the Housing Code and Article 33 B-C San Francisco Building Code.

Item 5. File 87-3, 2609-11 Lake St; Harold C. Dow, Architect AIA, Request for a variance from Section 508 and Table 5-D of the San Francisco Building Code.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 6. File 86-16, 865 Market St., Rolf Jensen & Associates; request for reconsideration of Condition #3 "Quick response throughout" imposed by the Board at the meeting of November 12, 1986.

SF
P85.35
#2
2/23/87

= Public Works

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
BOARD OF EXAMINERS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAR 12 1987
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Minutes of February 23, 1987

PRESENT: Mess. Cammisa, Degenkolb, Glumac, Hastings, Kennedy, Whittaker Lera.

CITY STAFF: Franklin Lew, Superintendent BBI
Larry Litchfield, Deputy Superintendent BBI
Rudy DeMay, Chief Electrical Inspector BBI
Chief Joseph Medina and Captain Charles Farrell, SFFD

ITEM 1. Adoption of Agenda

Lew suggested deletion of Item 4, since the Bureau has dropped its pursuit of requiring the sprinklering and stand pipe requirements. Other minor items in the case still remain but are not an issue to the Board.

So moved.

ITEM 2. Adoption of Minutes of November 12, 1986
Glumac moved-Kennedy Seconded as written

ITEM 3. ELECTRICAL BOARD OF EXAMINERS
File 87-1, Lithonia Reloc Wiring System; Request for Approval of Material of Construction.

LEW: The Board has heard 3 requests on the use of this type of wiring in 1977, 1978 and 1982. The Bureau does not have a position because of the previous approvals

DEMAY: Nothing in the Code prevents the wiring. The requirements are covered in Section 604 of the NEC. The Board had approved the use before for horizontal use only.

MEDINA: No position since this is a product approval question.

DEMAY: The prime concern is the color code of wire so that it is consistant with the SFEC code provisions.

K. SALVAGE: Introduced Eddy Hughes to explain product.

HUGHES: Described samples including the Yellow, Brown and Orange color coding available for the 220 wiring.

WHITTAKER: The product will be provided in SF with the proper color coding?

HUGHES: Yes.

GLUMAC: What type of field work is done with the wiring? What is the maximum length?

DEMAY: No limit.

HUGHES: There are limited horizontal runs. All that is supplied is the conduit and the wire. A short horizontal run will only occur at walls.

CAMMISA: Move approval of product with proper color coding and installed per all other code provisions for new and alteration construction.

Glumac Seconded
All Ayes

LEW: The Bureau asks if this approval sets precedence for other similar products.

BOARD: If installed per Code.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

ITEM 4: See comment on Agenda Adoption for deletion of this item.

ITEM 5: File 87-3, 2609-11 Lake Street; Harold C. Dow, Architect AIA, Request for a variance from Section 508 and Table 5-D of the San Francisco Building Code.

LEW: The request has been made to add a third story to an existing 2 story and basement building, therefore resulting in a 3 story building. The Code requires one hour construction throughout. The appellant will provide certain safety items which the Bureau cannot support.

MEDINA: The Fire Department supports the Bureau's position. A building of this height should be fully sprinklered.

DOW ARCH.: The building is an older building and cannot be made to meet one hour. We feel that a good deal is being provided to enhance the fire protection. We propose to sprinkler the basement, the top floor will be of one hour construction. By providing this level of protection we feel that we are improving the existing construction.

CAMMISA: Is the Fire Department's position that the entire building be sprinklered or provided with one hour construction.

MEDINA: Yes. Either a sprinkler system throughout or one hour construction.

CAMMISA: Can the applicant provide this?

DOW: No. Cost is the key factor.

GLUMAC: An equivalent degree of safety has not been provided for the two mid levels.

DOW: Referred to Code Ruling 73-16

LEW: That bulletin reflects the old Code and is not in effect at this time. The provisions of Section 504(d) reflect the current thinking and current code provisions.

MEDINA: We're willing to sit down with applicant to work out a solution.

LEW: What other safety features would you be willing to do?

DOW: Frankly, I cannot see any additional safety since the building is occupied. We could provide additional drywall on the ceilings to try to get a 1 hour floor.

WHITTAKER: Are there any items that could be added?

MEDINA: The new NFPA 13 excludes certain areas from sprinkler coverage, therefore the hardship may not be as severe. We could investigate this avenue.

DOW: Would be pleased to meet with FD and BBI to discuss.

HASTINGS: Moved referral to SFFD and BBI

DEGENKOLB: Seconded

All in favor.

ITEM 6: File 86-16, 865 Market St., Rolf Jensen & Associates; request for reconsideration of Condition #3 "Quick response throughout" imposed by the Board of Examiners at the meeting of 11/12/86.

DEGENKOLB: Asked to be excused from decision because of previous involvement on this project.

LEW: This appeal was heard in November 12, 1986 regarding the installation of an attrium. The approval was granted with the condition that quick response sprinkler heads be provided throughout the entire building. The Board placed an emphasis in the quick response heads, however, the applicant is now requesting the omission of QRS and in lieu providing standards heads. If the Board grants this request, the Bureau wishes to ask for some additional safety beyond that already submitted.

MEDINA: Would like to hear from applicant.

QUITTER: Presented the findings from the Fall NFPA meeting indicating that the design industry is questioning the design criteria to be used for QRS. We have provided smoke detectors throughout and will provide QRS at the attrium opening. This is a single line that can be designed to go off all at once.

MEDINA: Would you have any objections to using the Grinnel Dura Speed head?

QUITTER: I don't believe so. Could we supply a RTI that is faster than a standard head as an alternate to the Grinnel Dura Speed?

LEW: Would the Board have accepted this appeal without QRS's.

GLUMAC: We could now consider the Grinnel head or an increase in area of coverage.

QUITTER: I would prefer to design according to NFPA 13 and maybe use a medium RTI head such as the Grinnel Dura Speed.

GLUMAC: I am willing to suggest the medium RTI head in lieu of QRS. Is the area small area or a large wide open area?

QUITTER: Some of each, from a few 100 sq. ft. up to 15,000 sq. ft. Only the perimeter attrium opening is to have the QRS.

FARRELL: Are you leaving the QRS in the light hazard areas?

QUITTER: It was our intent to provide perimeter attrium QRS opening sprinklers only.

GLUMAC: It was my impression that QRS could be used in light hazard area. Standard heads be used in originary hazards.

CHERYL: The question is also; can QRS be used in large open area in a light hazard?

WHITTAKER: Can the FD accept the appeal as proposed. (ie QRS at perimeter of attrium and standard heads elsewhere).?

QUITTER: Could also provide QRS in seating area at lowest elevation.

LEW: Feel that the level of safety provided with QRS will not be provided with a mixed system.

GLUMAC: By deleting QRS, we have reduced the equivalency that was determined last time.

QUITTER: Itemized other levels of safety provided. See Nov. 12, 1986 notes for details.

GLUMAC: Would like to move that an acceptable medium RTI heads (equivalent to Grinnel Dura Speed) be allowed in place of QRS; that QRS remain at attrium perimeter at each floor; and that QRS be provided at the seating area to protect attrium opening under the bridge.

CAMMISA: Seconded

All Ayes
1 abstain-Degenkolb

LEW: Final Item not on agenda.

Introduced the new SFFD Fire Code and the introduction of the Fire Board.

MEDINA: Asked if the Board would like to sit in on Fire Board.

BOARD: Yes in general and whom could serve?

Hastings, Glumac, Whittaker and Cammisa to serve.
Other members to be appointed by Fire Chief per the SFFC. A copy of the Fire Code will be provided to each member. Chief Medina will act as secretary to the Fire Board of Examiners.

Adjourned at 7:25 pm.

Recordered By

L, L. Litchfield

LLL/mv

cc: Fran E. Glen
Jerry Roth, SF Public Library
Mark Intermaggio
EID
PAD
BID

85.35
1
15/87

SF Public Works

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

June 15.'87 - 6:00 pm
Rm. 282 City Hall

AGENDA

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 9 1987
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Item 1. Adoption of Agenda

Item 2. Approval of Minutes of February 23, 1987

NEW BUSINESS

Item 3. File 87-4, 907-911 Dolores St.; Ms. Phyllis Walker & Donald Morrison; Request for a variance from Chapter 5, Table 5D of the San Francisco Building Code.

Item 4. File 87-5, San Francisco Day School; J. Peter Winkelstein; Request for a variance from Section 505(d) of the 1984 San Francisco Building Code.

Item 5. File 87-6, 1929 Stockton St.; J. R. Loman; Table 5A of the San Francisco Building Code.

Item 6. File 87-7, 60-66 Macondray Lane, Polly Ogden; Request for a variance from NFPA-13D of the SF Fire Code.